

PEACE AND DISARMAMENT

Academic Studies

Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament

PEACE AND DISARMAMENT

ACADEMIC STUDIES

1982



Progress Publishers
Moscow

Translated from the Russian

Designed by *V. Yeryomtn*

Chief Editor—Academician N. N. Inozemtsev

Editorial Board: V. Ye. Aperian, Dr. Sc. (Econ.),
Academician G. A. Arbatov, O. N. Bykov, Dr. Sc. (Hist.),
Academician J. M. Gvishiani, L. A. Zak,
Dr. Sc. (Hist) (Deputy Chief Editor),
Academician M. A. Markov, G. I. Morozov, Dr. Sc. (Law),
A. D. Nikonov, Dr. Sc. (Hist.)

(Deputy Chief Editor), B. N. Polevoi],

Academician Ye. M. Primakov, V. N. Sedykh,
V. M. Falin, O. S. Kharkhardin, V. S. Shaposhnikov

«Мир и разоружение. Научные исследования». 1982

На английском языке

© Издательство «Наука», 1982

English translation © Progress Publishers 1982

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

М $\frac{11101-8}{016(01)-82}$ без объявл.

0801000000

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	9
------------------------	---

ARTICLES

Science and the Struggle for Peace

Science. Peace. Co-operation. By <i>A. Alexandrov</i>	15
The 26th CPSU Congress and Soviet Foreign Policy. By <i>N. Inozemtsev</i>	24
Peace and Human Progress. By <i>V. Zagladin</i>	34
International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. By <i>Ye. Chazov</i>	51

War, Politics, Detente

Detente's Difficult Paths. By <i>V. Falin</i>	59
Any Alternative to Military Equilibrium? By <i>O. Bykov</i>	77
Politics and War. By <i>A. Bovin</i>	95
Disarmament and the Foes of Dialogue. By <i>V. Israelyan</i>	112

Anti-War Movement

The Current Anti-War Movement—A Crucial Factor in the Struggle for Peace. By <i>V. Shaposhnikov</i>	120
The Working-Class Movement in Developed Capitalist Countries Fights for Peace. By <i>G. Diligensky, Ye. Yaropolov</i>	130
Not by the Sword Alone! By <i>Yu. Bondarev</i>	139
Art and the Struggle for Peace. Comments by a Stage Producer. By <i>G. Tovstonogov</i>	142
The Russian Orthodox Church in the Struggle for Peace and Disarma- ment. By <i>Yuvenaly</i>	147
The Muslims of the USSR in Support of Peace and Disarmament. By <i>Ziyautdinkhan ibn Ishan Babakhan</i>	158

REVIEWS

Soviet Public Organisations in the Struggle for Peace and Disarmament

Introduction	167
Association of Soviet Lawyers. By <i>A. Sukharev</i>	169
Soviet United Nations Association. By <i>V. Trukhanovsky</i>	173
The Committee of Youth Organisations of the USSR. By <i>V. Aksyonov</i>	177
The Soviet Women's Committee. By <i>V. Nikolayeva-Tereshkova</i>	181
Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament. By <i>G. Morozov</i>	186
Soviet Trade Unions. By <i>A. Subbotin</i>	192
The Soviet Committee of War Veterans. By <i>A. Maresyev</i>	199
The Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation. By <i>A. Chitikov</i>	203
The Soviet Peace Committee. By <i>O. Kharkhardin</i>	211
The Soviet Committee for Solidarity with Asian and African Coun- tries. By <i>A. Dzasokhov</i>	219
The Soviet Pugwash Committee. By <i>M. Markov</i>	223
The Soviet Peace Fund. By <i>B. Polevoi</i>	229
The Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Re- lations with Foreign Countries. By <i>Z. Kruglova</i>	234

MATERIALS AND DOCUMENTS

Concise Bibliography on Questions of Peace and Disarmament	241
Peace and Disarmament. Chronicle of Events (April 1980-December 1981). By <i>G. Ponomarev</i>	269
Chronicle of Meetings and Conferences Held by Scientists for Peace and Disarmament. By <i>V. Shvetsov</i>	330
To the Parliaments and Peoples of the World. An Appeal by the Supre- me Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	351
To the Second Special Session of the UN General Assembly	354
Peace and Disarmament Instruments Signed by the USSR in 1980 and 1981	: : :
Introduction. By <i>B. Nechayev, M. Lebedev</i>	358
Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation Between the USSR and the Syrian Arab Republic	362
Statement by the Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan	368
Communique of the Meeting of the Committee of Foreign Ministers of Warsaw Treaty Member-States	376
Joint Soviet-Ethiopian Statement	382
Joint Soviet-Mozambican Statement	391

Meeting of Leaders of WTO Countries	400
Joint Soviet-Indian Declaration	403
Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation Between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the People's Republic of the Congo . .	410
Communique of the Meeting of the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Warsaw Treaty Member-States . . .	415
Basic Documents of Important Public Peace Forums (1980-1981) . . .	424
Introduction. By <i>Y. Kharlamov</i>	424
For the Continuation of Detente and European Co-operation. Com- munique of the International Committee for European Security and Co-operation (Brussels, March 20-21, 1980)	429
Attention: War Danger! Appeal of the Session of the WPC Presiden- tial Committee (Budapest, May 8-10, 1980)	431
Communique of the International Forum-Dialogue for Disar- mament and Detente (Vienna, May 26-28, 1980)	433
To the Parliamentarians of the World. Appeal of the International Conference of Parliamentarians for Peace, Disarmament and In- ternational Security (Helsinki, May 30-June 1, 1980)	437
Charter of the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace (Sofia, September 23-27, 1980)	440
Appeal of the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace	446
Declaration of Participants in the Public Dialogue on Madrid- 1980	448
Final Document of the World Forum of Youth and Students for Peace, Detente and Disarmament	450
Disarmament and Peace for the Decade of the Eighties. Resolution of the Bureau of the WPC Presidential Committee (Antanana- rivo, January 23-26, 1981)	456
For a Conference on European Disarmament. Appeal of the Special NGO Committee on Disarmament (Geneva, February 2-6, 1981)	458
Communique of the International Conference Against the Arms Race and for Disarmament in Europe (Stockholm, June 6-8, 1981) .	459
Appeal to Women of the World of the World Congress of Women (Prague, October 8-13, 1981)	461
Declaration of the World Trade Union Conference on Social and Economic Aspects of Disarmament (Paris, December 15-17, 1981)	464
Index	475

Introduction

Peace and Disarmament. Academic Studies. 1982 is the second book in the series of publications of the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament. The series appears in Russian, English, French, Spanish and German. Compared to the first book, issued in 1980, the new edition covers a wider range of topical peace and disarmament issues, discussed in the context of the more complex international situation and the growing need to curb the arms race and prevent nuclear catastrophe.

The book was compiled toward the end of 1981, so 1982 developments remain largely outside its scope. For all their contradictory and diverse nature, the events of the first half of 1982 bear out the conclusion that the increased imperialist aggressiveness has put world politics on a dangerous path. Attempts are made to destroy the political, economic and legal basis of detente. Violence is again being elevated to the level of official policy, and the principles of peaceful coexistence, equality and equal security are sacrificed to imperial ambitions and claims to "world leadership". Consequently, strategic concepts are advanced that are rooted in the reckless notion that nuclear wars of various scales are acceptable and winnable.

The increased military threat (reflected, in 1982, in the armed conflict between Britain and Argentina and the Israeli aggression in Lebanon) generates justified world-wide concern and leads millions to take more vigorous and decisive action in defence of peace and against the arms race. This is highlighted by the mass anti-war movements, unprecedented in scope, which swept through Western Europe, Japan and the United States in 1982.

The Second Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament (June and July 1982), attended by representatives of over 150 countries and scores of non-governmental organisations, was an event of great importance. Guided by its desire to do all it can to prevent a nuclear holocaust and eliminate, ultimately, the very possibility of nuclear war, the Soviet Union advanced a historic initiative at the Session by taking on a unilateral obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

What explains such a bold move at a time when the United States and other NATO nuclear powers do nothing to even conceal their intention to be the first to use nuclear weapons in case of conflict? Leonid Brezhnev provided a comprehensive answer in his message to the Session when he stressed: "In taking this decision, the Soviet Union proceeds from the indisputable fact, which plays a determining role in the present-day international situation, that should a nuclear war begin, it could mean the destruction of human civilisation and perhaps the end of life itself on earth."

This peaceful Soviet move is aimed at facilitating a turn to a more stable peace and strengthening the hope of nations that there would be no nuclear conflagration anywhere, ever. For, if all the other nuclear powers follow the Soviet example and assume an equal obligation, the chances that a nuclear war may break out would be virtually eliminated. But this, it appears, is what does not suit US leaders. They hastened to voice their reluctance to "restrict their freedom of action in any way".

Aware of the danger inherent in a further deterioration of the international situation and of the growing need for effectively curbing the arms race, all those dedicated to peace welcomed the Soviet renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons and approved the numerous specific proposals the USSR put forward at the Special Session, including those on the drawing-up, adoption and stage-by-stage implementation of a nuclear disarmament programme, on a convention to prohibit the development, manufacture and accumulation of chemical weapons and to destroy their stockpiles. The new Soviet initiatives stem logically from the Peace Programme for the 80s, elaborated at the 26th Congress of the CPSU. They follow the Leninist course toward peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems, toward peaceful settlement of disputes.

The vigorous involvement of peace activists in efforts to safeguard

peace and prevent nuclear war is a promising international development, increasingly difficult to ignore. It has already contributed to forcing the Reagan Administration into agreeing to talks with the Soviet Union on nuclear armaments in Europe and then, at long last, 16 months after its inauguration, to the resumption of Soviet-US negotiations on strategic armaments. However, judging by several unofficial statements of the US government, it would like, in both cases, to virtually bypass the fundamental principle of equality and equal security. It remains to be seen whether the US government displays the necessary statesmanship and gives up its biased and unrealistic position. But time is in short supply. Any artificial obstacles and delays in curbing the arms race may cost mankind dearly.

The Soviet academic community and the public at large are convinced that no contradictions among states or groups of states, no differences in social systems, ways of life or ideologies, no short-term interests can obscure the vital and paramount need all nations share—to preserve peace and prevent nuclear catastrophe. Profound commitment to this philosophy inspired all those who took part in the preparation of this book.

Editorial Board

ARTICLES

Science and the Struggle for Peace

Science. Peace. Co-operation

**The 26th CPSU Congress and
Soviet Foreign Policy**

Peace and Human Progress

**International Physicians for the
Prevention of Nuclear War**

War, Politics, Detente

Detente's Difficult Paths

Any Alternative to Military Equilibrium?

Politics and War

Disarmament and the Foes of Dialogue

Anti-War Movement

**The Current Anti-War Movement—a Crucial
Factor in the Struggle for Peace**

**The Working-Class Movement in Developed
Capitalist Countries Fights for Peace**

Not by the Sword Alone!

Art and the Struggle for Peace

**The Russian Orthodox Church in the Struggle
for Peace and Disarmament**

**The Muslims of the USSR in Support
of Peace and Disarmament**

SCIENCE AND THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

SCIENCE. PEACE. CO-OPERATION

Academician ANATOLY ALEXANDROV

A prominent scientist and public figure, President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, b. 1903, graduated from Kiev University in 1930 and started his career in the Leningrad Physics and Technology Institute, working on polymers; was elected, as a physicist, corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences in 1943 and full member in 1953. He headed the Academy of Sciences' Institute of Physical Problems in 1946-1954, was Deputy Director of the Kurchatov Institute of Nuclear Energy in 1958-1960 and has been its Director since 1960 and President of the USSR Academy of Sciences since 1975. Anatoly Alexandrov is member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Most of his works deal with the physical properties of dielectrics and high-molecular compounds. Since 1946, Alexandrov has been in the field of nuclear power research.

Our time is characterised by the rapid development of science. This is a matter of necessity. Only the development of science can help find ways of meeting mankind's growing needs through calling into existence new areas of technics and technology, creating new materials and products and allowing to regulate the relationship between man and the environment.

The size of the world's population, the progress of the human race and the possibilities for its survival on the Earth are directly connected with the kind of use made of the present and future achievements of science. At the same time, certain actions prompted by today's state of scientific development, the reckless and irresponsible use of its fruits with the purpose of achieving seeming military superiority could affect conditions of life on our planet to such an extent that a considerable part of it would be rendered uninhabitable and mankind would degenerate for long if not for ever.

A thermonuclear war which even if unprovoked may break out accidentally is bound to become global. Its first few hours would see the death of hundreds of millions beings with many more destined to die in prolonged agony over the years to come as has been proved by the experience of the US dropping only two tiny—from our present point of view—bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Moreover, a number of successive generations would be affected by inevitable genetic changes. Such a prognostication is far from exaggerated. It is based on the close study of the problem by the public-spirited medical community of the world. Today we cannot yet provide accurate forecast as to what specific changes are to take place on the Earth due to the expected deterioration of the protective properties of the ozone layer which absorbs solar short-wave ultraviolet radiation, thus protecting us from its deadly effect.

As a result of the nuclear weapon tests conducted over the past years on the ground and in the atmosphere the natural radioactivity of the human body caused by the naturally occurring potassium isotope has been considerably exceeded by the radioactivity of cesium produced in the uranium fission chain reaction, i.e. during a nuclear explosion. Such excessive radioactivity has been observed in the people living many thousands of kilometres away from the place of nuclear tests.

In the event of nuclear war the radioactivity of our bodies would increase thousands of times, bringing about genetic changes, the impairment of the immunity mechanisms, the spread of cancer and other less known consequences. It is very likely that the madness of war will not be confined to the use of nuclear weapons. Chemical agents were already employed in small-scale wars. Having been further “improved” they are now intended to destroy all living beings, including vegetation. Of similar or even more pernicious effect would be the use of most sophisticated bacteriological weapons.

All the dangers threatening the very survival of humankind may emerge as a result of using the tremendous achievements of science to the detriment rather than the good of man.

To quote Albert Einstein, “the harnessing of the atom has changed everything except our way of thinking”. Indeed, since the days of old one part of the human community has been seeking to satisfy its needs at the expense of others through the use of force. Nowadays, too, the leaders of certain states regard *force* as the main factor in international relations. However, in our thermonuclear age clinging to savage menta-

lity is both senseless and intolerable as there can be no victors in a thermonuclear war. The efforts to assert this mentality would result in mankind's total degradation. At the same time, the judicious use of scientific achievements would make it possible to satisfy all human needs during practically unlimited time.

The greater technical potential of the armed forces accounts for the fact that modern warfare has exceeded the framework of engagements between the military units of the warring parties. It now spreads to considerable territories. Towns and cities with their civilian population, industry, transport, crops, cattle, the environment—everything has now become an object of destruction. These days warfare has acquired a global and total character, as is shown by World War II.

The use of nuclear weapons capable of hitting any point on our planet is bound to lead to a global catastrophe unless humanity shows sufficient will and reason to reject the use of all kinds of nuclear weaponry and reduce its stockpiles on a basis compatible with the equal security of the countries involved; to replace the practice of settling disputes between states by resorting to war with the practice of resolving all problems through negotiation and co-operation, i.e. in the only way worthy of those who think of themselves as *Homo sapiens*.

The Soviet Union is accused of creating a threat to peace. Let us recall, however, that the Soviet Union had not undertaken the development of nuclear weapons until it became clear that nazi Germany, on the one hand, and our ally, the United States (in dead secret from us), on the other, were creating such weapons. It is then, in 1943, that the Soviet Union was compelled to start developing atomic technology and nuclear weapons.

It took the United States six years to develop, with the help of scientists from many countries, the nuclear weapon. It was created in 1945. The Soviet Union had also spent six years on developing the nuclear weapon before producing it in 1949. In that year the United States launched the cold war against the Soviet Union. As that war went on, the United States, determined to assert its claims formulated in the motto "It is the US mission to govern the world", prepared for a nuclear attack on the Soviet Union, surrounding it with military bases equipped with atomic bombers. Evidence of this can be easily found in the newspapers and magazines of those days.

By way of response to the grave danger presented by US bases encircling the USSR, it was forced to develop inter-continental

thermonuclear missiles, *thus establishing an equilibrium between the vulnerability of its own territory and that of the USA in the event of an exchange of nuclear strikes.* With the US territory no longer unassailable, the situation could now be described as that of roughly equal risk.

In the early fifties the United States began to launch a whole fleet of atomic-powered submarines. The Soviet Union followed suit. Having started the development of similar submarines in 1953, the Soviet Union launched the first of them in 1958. Just like the first US atomic-powered submarine, it carried torpedoes only. Later modifications of both US and Soviet submarines were also equipped with missiles. The USA was the first (after the number of strategic missiles had been restricted) to sharply increase the number of nuclear warheads in its Minuteman strategic missile system by introducing multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles (MIRVs). It is natural that a few years later the USSR was to "reproduce" this "achievement". The same pattern was followed in the case of missile-carrying nuclear submarines, in the case of MIRVs carried by submarines, etc. These days the same situation is being created by the United States through the development of cruise and MX missiles. It is natural that the Soviet scientists and engineers have always had to see to it that the materiel developed in the USSR could counterbalance effectively the superiority gained by the United States.

The carefully ascertained balance of forces agreed upon in the SALT-2 Treaty might have secured, until 1985, considerable advantage for the United States in terms of the total number of warheads largely contributed to by the warheads of the aircraft-carried nuclear weapons.¹ Nonetheless, this agreement has not been ratified by the United States and therefore unrestrained military build-up goes on.

It is of interest to compare some other aspects in the development of atomic and thermonuclear technology.

In 1954 the USSR launched an atomic power plant, the first one to be built in the world. This signalled the beginning of the development of atomic power engineering designed to serve peaceful purposes. In 1958 the first nuclear-powered vessel intended for purely peaceful purposes, the ice-breaker *Lenin*, was launched. The USSR has always considered the knowledge related to the development of the civilian aspects of its nuclear technology common property of mankind. For

¹ See: *Scientific American*, No. 5, November 1979, pp. 45-55.

this reason, detailed information on the working principles of the first atomic power plant, the Siberian APP and the ice-breaker *Lenin*, was communicated to the First and Second Geneva conferences.

During his 1956 visit to Harwell (Great Britain), Academician I. V. Kurchatov read the first communication on the use of controlled thermonuclear fusion for peaceful purposes. In the years to follow, Soviet scientists continued to inform the world's scientific community on the results achieved in those areas of nuclear power engineering where they took the lead. Today, Soviet scientists continue to pioneer the way for research in this field carried on in many countries of the world, including the United States. They have also played the role of trail-blazers in the field of nuclear fuel conversion in fast reactors.

How did things develop in the military field? The results of testing various types of nuclear-missile weapons both by the USSR and the USA indicated that the damage to be suffered by each of the two countries in the event of nuclear war would be equally "unacceptable". The peace initiatives advanced by the USSR, eventually led, after some hesitation on the part of the Western countries, to a most important result: decisions were adopted on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, on banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in the sea and on land, on limiting the number of strategic nuclear-missile installations and on some other matters. These decisions based on equal security of both parties. The process of detente started. This process, despite a number of dangerous setbacks, made it possible for the world to live several years without any major wars. It would seem that in future, too, it might secure peaceful coexistence of nations in the conditions created by the rapidly growing scientific potential.

The rapid development of nuclear physics, the research in the field of isotopes, nuclear reactions and fundamental particles have called into existence numerous research methods, among them the activation and the tracer methods. The new supersensitive techniques made it possible to observe transformations of individual fundamental particles and the behaviour of both separate atoms and atoms bound in molecules. There appeared sophisticated electronic devices, such as various multichannel analysers, and computers intended primarily for computation and measurement procedures in nuclear physics and technology.

All this was passed on to related sciences giving tremendous impetus to development in other fields, among them biochemistry, biology, medicine, chemistry, astronomy, archeology, geology, the study

of the age of rock. Finally, this stimulated direct space exploration.

The ideas concerning the fundamentals of science have radically changed. There appeared new concepts of the evolution of the Universe, the structure of matter, the mechanisms of vital processes, etc. The purely applied results of this scientific progress have acquired tremendous importance.

The destinies of mankind depend, to a considerable extent, on the problem of power supply. The availability of sufficient energy resources is the most important prerequisite for the solution of other major problems facing humanity, such as the problem of food, raw materials, the problem of new alternative materials, and also the problem of regulating the climate and other properties of the environment which is likely to arise in future.

The growth of the world's population (which is to increase from the present 4.5 to 6 thousand million in the year 2000) calls for a corresponding increase in energy supplies, for the solution of the food and raw materials problems. The matter is rendered even more complicated by the fact that the various vital needs of each individual are growing in parallel with the development of material and spiritual culture. The production of foodstuffs calls for increased crop yields and, consequently, additional energy consumption involved in the production and application of fertilisers, in improved cultivation, etc. The manufacture of sophisticated machinery calls for greater energy consumption involved in the extraction of metals and other materials from the greater depths and poorer and smaller deposits. New, synthesised materials, fodder and foodstuffs are becoming more and more important. On the other hand, technological improvements make it possible to use energy resources more sparingly. Although this factor has an important role to play, per capita energy consumption has a tendency to grow as time goes on. Furthermore, the natural energy resources, especially the unrestorable ones, i.e. oil, gas and coal which account for 90 per cent of energy consumption, are not limitless. While coal deposits are still sizeable enough and coal is not going to impose restrictions on human needs for the centuries to come, oil and gas, the most convenient types of energy resources which now account for nearly 70 per cent of energy consumption, threaten to be exhausted much earlier. The power balance of the majority of countries will completely cease to depend on oil in some 20 to 50 years.

In the next 200 years the growing energy needs will be met only

through the use of atomic energy (provided by heavy nuclei fission) and later also through the use of thermonuclear energy (derived from the light nuclei fusion) in addition to the energy provided by coal. As has been proved by Soviet researchers, the development of all aspects of atomic power engineering makes it possible to combine the process of power generation with nuclear fuel conversion. Provided the appropriate rate of nuclear fuel conversion is secured, *mankind will be able to meet all its energy requirements during many millennia to come.*

It should be stressed that the most thorough investigations have clearly indicated that all other sources of energy—the Sun, the tide and waves, as well as biological resources, could compensate for only insignificant percentage (about ten per cent) of atomic power. Therefore, a wider use of atomic power is inevitable. Under conditions of peace, none of the conceivable types of faults that may arise in the normally safe work of atomic power plants can do any serious harm to human beings.

Insignificant radioactive leakages due to some faults usually do not lead to any serious consequences. (Admittedly, the trouble-shooting in the case of atomic power plants costs more than that in the case of non-atomic power plants.) The fears associated with atomic power plants are groundless, and there is no sense in comparing the APP with the atom bomb. The analysis of the harmful effect of effluents occurring during the normal operation of atomic and coal-burning power plants shows that in the latter case effluents are dozens of times more harmful than those in the former.

In our own lifetime as well as in that of our descendants priority is sure to be given to atomic power as the basis of mankind's well-being and a means to solve the many problems it faces..

These days Soviet scientists take great pains to secure the direct use either of atomic power itself or of the secondary energy carriers, high-energy substances and the like obtained with the help of atomic power in all major areas of energy consumption. The construction of atomic heat supply plants is already under way. Considerable efforts are devoted to elaborating chemical, plasma- and electrochemical production processes, including those of obtaining liquid fuel by coal conversion.

Atomic power engineering of any scale required, forever provided with sufficient fuel, forever delivering humanity from energy and raw-material crises, and making it possible to develop new techniques in chemistry, bioengineering, food and materials production is science's

precious gift to humanity, a gift not to lose its value over thousands of years to come.

One would think that an achievement of such dimensions could of itself accelerate the process of detente. Indeed, it is the lack of energy as well as metallurgical and mineral resources that some states refer to in an attempt to justify their actions exacerbating the present tensions in the world. Why did the US brass hats call for hostilities in response to the 1973 decision of the Arab oil-exporting countries to place embargo on oil deliveries to the United States? Why did the collapse of the Shah's regime in Iran lead to the attempts of US military interference in Iranian events? Why does the US fleet (equipped with nuclear weapons, by the way) patrol the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf?

It is believed that the United States, Japan and all industrially advanced West European countries without exception would very soon lose their importance, that a global cataclysm would take place, should the oil-exporting nations cut off oil supply to them. The problem with other raw materials is also very acute, although it is not so grave as with oil. Fortunately, the USSR and other socialist countries, although they are obliged to use their oil and gas resources sparingly, are still in a position to develop their economies for a long time to come without being threatened with a fuel crisis which would certainly aggravate the already acute energy shortage experienced in the world. Faster development of atomic power engineering could, in principle, change the situation. The danger of an energy crisis would be removed and oil could be used primarily as chemical, biological raw material and, possibly, in the food industry over dozens of years to come. This would also facilitate the solution of the food problem.

Under the programme of accelerated development of atomic power engineering launched in accordance with the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, the Soviet Union is to make wider use of atomic power in all areas of energy consumption. Considerable resources of oil and gas available in the country will make it possible to ensure an optimal combination of the consumption of oil, gas, atomic power and coal (including the products of its conversion) in the 21st century. This could be done with a view to gradually ousting oil from the area of power generation into the field of chemistry and bioengineering. This is going to be a prolonged, labour- and material-consuming process and its fundamental stage will take some fifty years.

Similar processes are bound to occur in the Western and developing countries. Lacking oil resources, some of the latter may find themselves among the first victims of an oil crisis, although at present—largely due to the slump—oil production is in excess of the demand.

In view of the enormous cost and high labour intensity of restructuring the energy supply systems badly needed by practically all countries, it would be advisable to launch joint programmes under which groups of countries could co-ordinate their research and development efforts and join forces in employing labour (which could be given specialised training) and in manufacturing the necessary equipment. The steps involved in such co-operation would increase the flow of funds to the developing countries, secure fuller utilisation of industrial capacities in all countries and considerably reduce international tensions because all nations would be bound by their common commitment to creating new power supply facilities.

It stands to reason that all this can be realised provided an international agreement is reached on banning the use of atomic power stations, radiochemical plants and irradiated fuel storages to amplify the destructive effect of conventional and, especially, nuclear weapons. Suffice it to say that exchange strikes at atomic power plants carried out by both sides with one-megaton strategic or medium-range nuclear missiles would render uninhabitable practically all the territory of Europe and a greater part of the territories of Canada and the United States. Israel's June 1981 attack on a nuclear centre in Iraq showed that such ideas are not alien to those who prepare for war.

It is still not too late for mankind to opt for the road of humanism and reason. Our country has no reason for attacking Western Europe or any other country. I am deeply convinced that West European countries would not stand to gain from attacking the USSR either. I hope that all, or almost all, the leaders of the West European countries share this view.

Therefore a military conflict in the "European theatre" may occur only with the direct United States involvement, i.e. in the form of a total war. As for the consequences of such a war, there can be no two opinions. Mankind is faced with difficulties. But it would be a folly and a tragedy to try and settle them through the use of force and thus end its own existence.

THE 26TH CPSU CONGRESS AND SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY

Academician **NIKOLAI INOZEMTSEV**

Historian and economist, specialised in world economics and international relations, b. 1921. He fought in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-45, graduated from the Moscow Institute of International Relations in 1949. Corresponding member (1964) and full member (1968) of the USSR Academy of Sciences. He became Director of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations in 1966 and member of the Presiding Board of the Academy of Sciences in 1975. Nikolai Inozemtsev was member of the CPSU Central Committee, deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet and member of its Foreign Affairs Commission, member of the World Peace Council, the Soviet Peace Committee and the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation, Chairman of the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament.

He is the author of many works on world economics, foreign policy and international relations. Nikolai Inozemtsev died on 12 August 1982.

Each period in history, each stage of international relations displays distinctive features of its own, each raises problems to be solved. Naturally, this fully applies to the present period of the early 1980s.

It is a well-known fact that at the beginning of the 1980s the positive changes in international relations which it took so much joint effort to bring about in the past decade have, for various reasons, been placed in jeopardy. This conferred particular urgency on such issues as the future of detente, the ways to overcome the new round in the arms race, extremely dangerous in its scope and nature, the prospects of international co-operation, and security and peace.

These issues affect vital interests of all nations and groups of nations, whether socialist, capitalist or developing—in short, of all mankind. These are issues facing each military-political alliance, each country and each political party. The course they pursue can either help improve the international climate or compound the existing difficulties.

Obviously, this attracts particular attention to the policy statements and actions by the leaders of the great powers, first and foremost of the countries possessing especially great economic, political, military-strategic and other capabilities.

This article deals with the decisions taken at the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, held in Moscow from February 23 to March 3, 1981, and outlines the programme of action and the main foreign policy guidelines the Congress has elaborated.

I would like to begin by stressing the profoundly constructive approach the Congress displayed with relation to the problems discussed, the organic connection between, on the one hand, the domestic economic and social policy it drew up and, on the other hand, its foreign policy guidelines. "We intend to concentrate all our efforts in two related directions," Leonid Brezhnev said in his closing statement. "One is the building of communism, the other is the strengthening of peace."¹

Significantly, the Congress analysed not only the results of the recent tenth 5-year period (1976-1980) but also the overall economic policy of the 1970s. Similarly, turning to the future, the Congress did not confine itself to setting forth the tasks for the eleventh 5-year period (1981-1985); it also discussed the key economic issues viewed from the angle of national development throughout the 1980s. In other words, rather than taking merely short-term decisions it advanced a development strategy, a long-term economic and social policy. And indeed, domestic policy greatly affects foreign policy because the two are inseparable.

The Congress reiterated the highest goal of the Party's economic strategy—concern for man, for improved material and cultural conditions of the Soviet people. The following figures highlight the achievements in this field over the past decade. Average monthly pay grew by 40 per cent by the early 1980s compared to 1970, with prices for

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. The 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1981, p. 153.

basic goods remaining unchanged. The production and consumption of consumer goods rose by over 50 per cent in that period. More housing was built over the decade than the entire urban housing space available in the early 1960s.

The Congress decided that the share of consumption and accumulation in the national income was to increase at least by 40 per cent by 1990. This will allow for greater effort, in the eleventh and twelfth 5-year periods, aimed at an all-round improvement of living standards, including higher consumption, expanded housing construction, better working and living conditions, further development of culture, etc.

Notably, despite the deterioration of the international situation and the steep rise in the military expenditures of the United States and some other capitalist countries, the Congress considered it possible to raise the share of consumption in the national income to 77.3 per cent in 1985 (against 75.3 per cent in 1980). It is equally significant that the growth rates of the so-called Group B (the consumer goods production) are to be higher than those of Group A (production of the means of production).

The Congress decision to develop a special food programme vividly reflects the peaceful aims of Soviet economic policy. This programme, which is to provide a radical solution to the problem of food supplies, embraces both agriculture as such and the related industries—in other words, the entire agro-industrial complex, transport and trade. In 1981-1985, capital investment in agriculture is to at least equal the 1976-1980 figure—over 170,000 million rubles, or over 27 per cent of total capital investment in the economy. No doubt, the solution of the food problem in the Soviet Union will significantly contribute to the solution of this problem on the global scale.

The same applies to the energy problem, another global issue of great importance. The resources earmarked for its solution in 1981-1985 exceed the respective figure for 1976-1980 by about 50 per cent. Oil extraction will continue to rise in the eleventh five-year period, but the production of natural gas will develop at much higher rates. Coal production will rise considerably. The capacity of atomic power stations will approximately double. All this will make it possible to radically alter the structure of the energy balance. Despite its rapidly growing domestic requirements, the Soviet Union remains one of the largest exporters of energy and energy sources, above all natural gas and oil. Large-scale work will continue on new sources of energy, in-

cluding efforts to lay the foundations of thermonuclear power engineering. This undertaking is of such great importance that it cannot be regarded as having to do exclusively with domestic Soviet problems.

I would like to note another distinctive feature of the decisions the 26th Congress took on economic issues. The Soviet Union now leads in many important fields of production; vast resources are pouring into the national economy; we command first-rate scientific and technological potential. At the same time, a number of factors hampering economic development will operate in the 1980s, including the slower increase of manpower resources, the higher costs of developing the eastern and northern regions, greater investments into environmental protection and the infrastructure, and the need to renew production assets at higher rates. With due regard both to the country's potential and to the distinctive features of the forthcoming period, the 26th CPSU Congress set the central task of completing the economy's switch to mostly intensive development.

The Congress also mapped out the major ways of attaining this goal. These are the fuller and more efficient use of all resources and more thrifty management of the available production potential. Also, accelerated scientific and technological progress, the concentration of large-scale scientific efforts on ways to solve key economic problems, and the introduction of advanced technology into all branches of the economy. Also, appropriate structural policies designed to ensure fuller satisfaction of social needs. And finally, the fuller use of the opportunities inherent in the improvement of economic management methods.

I would like to stress that the course toward the intensification of and radical structural shifts in the national economy offers additional opportunities in the field of Soviet economic, scientific and technological co-operation with other countries. Other members of the socialist community have been and remain the principal foreign policy partners of the Soviet Union. At the same time, the 26th CPSU Congress expressly noted that we would keep the door open for expanding co-operation with the interested capitalist countries.

For all their brevity, these considerations reflect the thoroughly peaceful aims of the Soviet economic development plans and give the lie to the attempts at picturing our country as a totalitarian power bent on building up its military might.

It is perfectly logical for Soviet leaders to take into account the current international situation and to be constantly concerned with

strengthening our national security; the terrible losses our people suffered in World War II are well known. But this is explained by strictly defensive considerations: the Soviet Union has never sought and is not seeking military superiority over anyone. As Leonid Brezhnev said at the Congress, "To try and outstrip each other in the arms race or to expect to win a nuclear war, is dangerous madness."¹

The Central Committee of the CPSU and the Soviet government have always attached foremost importance to securing the necessary external conditions for the Soviet people so that they would be able to solve the peaceful constructive tasks facing the country. Hence the unwavering loyalty to the principle of peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems, elaborated by Lenin, the founder of the Soviet state. Hence the specific programme advanced by the 26th Party Congress and aimed at radically alleviating the tense international situation. This programme envisages action in several directions.

One of these is further development of constructive relations with the capitalist countries. The Congress highlighted the Soviet Union's readiness

- to continue developing dynamic, positive relations with France, the FRG, Italy, Finland, Austria and other West European nations, with Canada, Mexico, Brazil, Argentina and other countries;

- to hold a dialogue with the United States (for the international situation as a whole largely depends on the state of relations between these two powers), including a Soviet-American summit meeting;

- to overcome the slump in Soviet-British relations which set in through no fault of the Soviet Union, and establish durable and truly neighbourly relations with Japan.

Another important direction is that of relations with the countries recently liberated from colonial oppression. The growing role these countries play in world economics and politics is well known, and so is the fact that several conflicts have recently flared up among them. The Congress noted the successful co-operation with India and a number of other Asian and African countries. It reiterated recognition of each nation's right to choose the system it prefers, shape its own destiny and exercise sovereignty over its natural resources, came out against any form of domination over these countries or including them in the "sphere of interests" of this or that power, and emphasised

¹ *Documents and Resolutions...*, p. 31.

respect for the status of non-alignment. One might note that if all countries observed this kind of code of conduct the world would be a much easier place to live in.

The Congress underlined that a radical improvement of the international situation demands elimination of the existing hotbeds of armed conflicts. The general rise in tensions adversely affects the situation in individual regions. In turn, local conflicts stimulate one another and aggravate the overall trend leading to greater tensions. With this in mind, the Soviet Union has advanced balanced considerations and initiatives which take into account the interests of various parties and envisage political settlement of the acute crises in the Middle and Far East, and measures to ensure peace in the Persian Gulf area and other hot spots.

The Congress devoted particular attention to the problems of curbing the arms race and alleviating the war danger, a danger which, regrettably, has been looming larger in recent years.

Unswervingly pursuing its fundamental course toward arms limitation, the Soviet Union reiterated its readiness to work for a general and complete ban on nuclear tests, for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, for the exclusion of chemical and other mass destruction weapons from national arsenals, its readiness to spare no effort in order to move ahead at the Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe.

At the same time, in view of the recent complications in the international situation, the 26th CPSU Congress considered it necessary to complement the Peace Programme proclaimed by the 24th and 25th Party congresses with new and significant ideas and proposals. The aim is, above all, to achieve substantial progress in implementing confidence-building measures in the military field. The Soviet Union said it was prepared to extend these measures to its entire European part—naturally, on condition that the West, too, extended the confidence zone accordingly. Besides, the Soviet Union is prepared to hold concrete negotiations on confidence-building measures in the Far East, an important and turbulent region where the Soviet Union, China and Japan border on each other and where the United States has military bases.

These measures also envisage—and that is especially important—substantial progress in the limitation and reduction of strategic armaments. The Soviet Union proclaimed its readiness to continue the rele-

vant negotiations with the United States without delay, preserving all the positive elements achieved so far in this area. The Soviet Union is prepared to negotiate limitation of weapons of all types. Among other things, the USSR would be ready to come to terms on limiting the deployment of the new US Ohio-type submarines and the similar Soviet Typhoon system, and on banning modernisation of the existing and development of new ballistic missiles for these submarines. In order to prevent further accumulation of nuclear weapons in Europe, the Soviet Union proposed a moratorium on the deployment in this region of new medium-range missiles of the NATO countries and the Soviet Union, thus freezing the existing level of these weapons, which, naturally, would include the US forward-based systems. The proposal envisages a freeze both on the quantity and, we emphasise, on the quality of these weapons.

Developing its constructive initiative on the question of defusing the nuclear confrontation in Europe, the Soviet Union advanced new far-reaching proposals in late 1981 and early 1982. These are designed to help find a mutually acceptable solution which would ward off the danger of a nuclear conflagration.

The Soviet Union added substantially to its moratorium proposal by expressing its readiness, if the other side agrees to the moratorium, to unilaterally reduce part of its medium-range nuclear weapons in the European part, moving toward the lower level which could be agreed at the Soviet-US talks.

At the Geneva talks on nuclear arms limitation in Europe the Soviet Union intends to advocate radical reductions of medium-range weapons on both sides—not by tens but by hundreds of units. Of course, this should take into account both US forward-based systems and the relevant nuclear weapons of Britain and France.

The Soviet Union would be prepared to negotiate complete renunciation by both sides, the West and the East, of all types of medium-range nuclear weapons targeted against Europe. Moreover, the USSR is in favour of a truly “zero option” with regard to nuclear armaments in Europe—that is, the absence, in the final analysis, of all nuclear weapons from Europe, both medium-range and tactical.

Finally, other proposals intended to improve the international situation include setting up a competent international committee comprising the most eminent scientists of different countries to advocate the vital necessity of preventing a nuclear catastrophe, and convening a

special session of the UN Security Council with the participation of the top leaders of its member-states (and of leaders of other countries if they so wish) in order to look for keys to improving the international situation.

In his March 16, 1982 speech at the 17th Congress of Soviet Trade Unions, Leonid Brezhnev announced the Soviet decision to introduce a unilateral moratorium on the deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons in the European part of the USSR. Besides, the Soviet Union intends to reduce a certain number of its medium-range missiles as early as 1982, if there is no new aggravation of the international situation. The Soviet head of state called on the US government not to raise contrived obstacles to SALT talks and to resume them without delay. Leonid Brezhnev also proposed that prior to this resumption the two sides should undertake a mutual obligation not to deploy sea- and ground-launched long-range cruise missiles. And finally, he expressed the Soviet Union's readiness to negotiate a mutual restriction on naval operations—specifically, to recall missile-carrying submarines from the currently large areas of combat-ready patrolling and to restrict their zone of operations to mutually agreed limits.

These and other proposals advanced at the 26th CPSU Congress and in the course of subsequent foreign policy initiatives by our Party and government could, we believe, provide a constructive basis for an earnest discussion. Naturally, the Soviet Union does not at all claim an exclusive right to set forth ideas and proposals of particular interest from the standpoint of ensuring international security. There are, of course, other fields of potential diplomatic activity and many questions demanding clarification, specification and further elaboration—but the purpose of negotiations is precisely to identify the positions of the parties, to search for and find mutually acceptable solutions. And the need for such solutions is very urgent today—both because of the distinctive features of the current international situation, when the chief accomplishments of detente are in jeopardy, and because of the fact that advances in military technology have long been considerably outstripping the progress of all diplomatic talks on arms limitation and reduction. This is an ominous development, fraught with grave dangers for mankind.

At the heart of the Soviet proposals and the initiatives advanced by the 26th Congress is the philosophy of peace which underlies all Soviet foreign policy, the striving to prevent a new world war which

would inevitably involve the use of nuclear missiles, with all the terrible consequences this implies.

The harsh reality of today is that, in contrast to the past, the correlation of the extremely important concepts of "war" and "politics" has changed completely in international relations. The revolution that has been going on for several decades in the means of warfare, the vast accumulation of nuclear missiles make it suicidal to rely on armed force and hope that it would bring victory. The impossibility of a pre-emptive nuclear strike is a salient feature of today's world: no matter how a war is launched, the aggressor cannot escape devastating retribution.

Historical responsibility to the living and future generations, plain common sense and, more, the elementary instinct for self-preservation demand that the policies of all nations, all governments and parties accord absolute priority to ensuring the fundamental human right—the right to life. This therefore calls for the strengthening and deepening, not curtailment, of detente, for expanding, not reducing, international co-operation in all its forms.

However, far from all statesmen and politicians think in terms of today's realities. Unfortunately, some Western leaders still proceed from outdated notions and not from realism in their approach to the problems of nuclear war. Hence statements to the effect that there are more important things than peace. But what can be more important than preserving life on Earth and civilisation itself? Hence the desire to promote the illusion that nuclear war can be limited and therefore should not be feared too much. This brings to mind Mao Zedong's famous words about the chance to build "a civilisation a thousand times more beautiful" from Earth's radioactive debris. Finally, hence the deliberate understatement of the dangers inherent in efforts to spur up the arms race and the ever increasing attempts at upsetting the balance of forces in the field of strategic armaments.

The strategic parity between the Soviet Union and the United States, the approximate equilibrium between the armed forces of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO can serve as the basis of international stability and, more importantly, as the starting point for a steady reduction in the level of military confrontation, for progress to genuine disarmament. Conversely, attempts by either side to upset this parity are fraught with a new, inevitably more dangerous round of the arms race. More dangerous above all because of its scope—for example,

the United States is contemplating annually increasing its military expenditures by tens of billions of dollars. More dangerous also because new types of weapons may well appear which would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to control.

In conclusion I would like to stress that the preservation and consolidation of detente, a curb on the arms race not only provide the basis for the maintenance of peace but also a necessary prerequisite for solving many other problems facing all countries without exception in the last three decades of the 20th century.

The Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community would much prefer to find a better use for the resources devoured by the arms race. A reduction in military appropriations could aid the economically developed capitalist countries in their action against inflation and unemployment, and accelerate the advancement of the developing countries.

Besides, we should not lose sight of the fact that, whether we want it or not, the 1980s will aggravate such large-scale long-term and truly global problems as providing the growing world population with food and the world economy with energy and raw materials, protecting the environment, mastering the resources of the World Ocean and outer space, etc. There is also the urgent problem of restructuring international economic relations on a just and democratic basis. The reasons for this are not purely humanitarian either: the development rates and the state of the world economy will largely depend on the type of relations between the developed and the developing countries. A foremost condition for a successful solution of these global problems is a healthy international climate, relations of trust and co-operation, not tension, prejudice or fear, joint efforts by all nations and groups of nations—socialist, capitalist and developing.

I would like to end by expressing my conviction that common sense will prevail in the approach to all these issues, that mankind will solve, at a minimum cost to itself, the problems of social and national progress, of further developing the scientific and technological revolution, the productive forces and international relations.

PEACE AND HUMAN PROGRESS

Professor VADIM ZAGLADIN

A party official, journalist, historian and sociologist, b. 1927. After graduating from the Moscow Institute of International Relations in 1949 he taught at this institute and worked for the *New Times* and *World Marxist Review*. Deputy Chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department since 1967 and First Deputy Chief since 1975. He is member of the CPSU Central Committee, deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet, secretary of its Foreign Affairs Commission, Deputy Chairman of the USSR Parliamentary Group, Deputy Chairman of the Working-Class and National Liberation Movement Research Council, member of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation.

Most of his works are on the international communist and working-class movement.

In his closing speech at the 26th Congress of the CPSU Leonid Brezhnev specially noted the correlation between peace and human progress: "In our age these two concepts are inseparably linked. Peace is the crucial condition for progress in all fields of human endeavour."¹

Everyone should grasp this connection. A lack of understanding of its current and future significance may lead to the adoption of political courses capable of destroying everything man has created throughout his history, of threatening the very survival of intelligent life on our planet.

It has long been clear that the problems involved in the struggle against wars in general and above all global wars call for an urgent

¹ *Documents and Resolutions*. . . , p. 156.

solution. Lenin wrote that the question of imperialist wars "has been the keystone of all policy in all the countries of the globe since 1914. It is a question of life and death for millions upon millions of people."¹

It is a fact that the sway of private property distorts the operation of several objective laws of social development. For example, it has forced the objective law of internationalisation of human life to take the shape of armed conflicts with their monstrous waste of life and material values created by man's labour. In Europe alone, 3.3 million people died in the wars of the 17th century. The figure for the 18th century was 5.4 million and for 1801-1914, 5.7 million. In 1914, the monopolist striving to redivide the already divided world sparked off World War I which took a toll of over 20 million lives—more than all the wars in Europe over the preceding three centuries.²

Only two decades after World War I, nazi Germany, encouraged by the same old insatiable craving of capital this time striving for world domination, unleashed World War II. The losses it inflicted on mankind exceeded those in all the preceding European wars.

Over the past 50 centuries mankind has lived through a total of 14,500 large- and small-scale wars in which, it is estimated, over 3,640 million people have been killed. The material losses these wars have caused are estimated at about 1,350 trillion dollars.

Today mankind is facing the threat of a third world war. This threat is greater than all the dangers man has encountered throughout his history. This is rooted above all in the character of modern weapons and, taking a broader view, in the disparity between the development of the productive forces and the state of social and international relations.

The grasping of the innermost laws governing the motion of matter has become the landmark of our century and the greatest stride man has taken toward penetrating nature's mysteries. The opportunities open to man have multiplied tremendously. But the way they are being used is quite another matter.

The history of nuclear weapons provides the best example of the way an exploiter system uses the achievements of the human intellect

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, p. 55.

² *Militarizm. Razoruzheniye* (Militarism. Disarmament), Moscow, 1963, pp. 8, 11.

to the detriment of man. A magnificent scientific breakthrough that *in principle* made the solution of the major problems plaguing mankind more feasible is being used first and foremost for developing and manufacturing new deadly weapons.

In discussions, Western scientists and politicians often ask what all that has to do with the particularly "evil nature" of exploiter society. After all, socialist countries also produce such weapons, weapons that are quite sophisticated enough.

That is, of course, true. But socialism was *forced* to take up the manufacture of these weapons because they had appeared in the West. Here one might stress that nuclear weapons were first developed not to be used for war *in general* but to help impose a Pax Americana on the world and confrontation on the Soviet Union. It appears that an important mission of historians is to provide the public in the Soviet Union and abroad with much more comprehensive information about the way US reactionaries were preparing for a nuclear war against our country in 1945 even before World War II was completely over.

In other words, capitalism created nuclear weapons with the aim of "solving" the contradiction between the two social systems by destroying socialism in a nuclear war. Obviously, socialism had to take this into account and create an appropriate counterpoise.

It is of great benefit to mankind that such a counterpoise was developed, that there is in the world today a new alignment of forces which ties the hands of the militarists and checks their reckless ventures: this new alignment of forces has, for well over three decades now, been shielding the nations from a world nuclear conflict.

Today the situation is such that the currently available stockpiles of modern weapons can destroy hundreds of millions of people in a matter of hours. Runaway accumulation of nuclear weapons increases the risk of their accidental use. Further proliferation of these weapons will intensify the danger of their use by uncontrollable adventurist forces. All these truths have long become commonplace. However, the trouble is that now, in the early 1980s, they no longer provide a comprehensive picture of the actual dangers bred by the arms race. The reasons are as follows.

First, military technology has advanced to such a stage when new and increasingly terrible means of destruction appear with unprecedented speed. A new tank, plane or missile are hardly put into pro-

duction when an improved model appears. The rates at which armaments are perfected increasingly outstrip the political progress toward ending the arms race. The danger inherent in this situation is obvious.

Second, military technology has reached a radically new level in perfecting the means of destruction. It is not only that each new missile or bomb is more deadly than its predecessor: the important thing is that its effect on people, on all military and civilian targets is different. Each new type is increasingly detrimental to nature, all its inner links and functions. And this presages the development, tomorrow or the day after, of such types of weapons which, applied even once, can produce totally unforeseeable consequences, affecting both man and his environment.

Third, the weapons created by nuclear technology are assuming such forms that actual control over them is becoming more and more difficult. The miniaturisation of nuclear weapons and the perfection of their production technology may soon make control over their manufacture and proliferation questionable. This means that peace and mankind's future may easily be found at the mercy of adventurers.

Fourth, the current advances in military technology—especially the emergence of the neutron bomb—appear to be gradually lowering the threshold separating nuclear war from conventional. “Appear to be lowering”, because in actual fact this threshold cannot disappear. No matter how destructive an artillery charge, no matter how powerful a tank, their use, while causing great loss of life and damaging property, does not affect the genetic structure of man or his environment. Nuclear weapons—even a nuclear handgun—affect everything living in a way that cannot be predicted. Suffice it to recall Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The atomic bombs dropped in 1945 are still crippling and killing people. The victims are not only those who were there at the time of the explosion but also people born many years later.

The manufacture of neutron weapons and the development of laser weapons show that specialists do not relax their efforts aimed at creating ever newer types of “clean” weapons allegedly limited in their destructive effect—weapons which would not be as alarming as multi-megaton bombs and which could therefore allay man's vigilance against a world-wide nuclear catastrophe. One might add that the propaganda channels at the disposal of those who worship nuclear destruction are doing their utmost to reconcile people to the absurd no-

tion that tactical use of nuclear weapons is "acceptable" and "legitimate" and that "limited" nuclear war is possible.

These and similar doctrines have been exposed convincingly by leaders of the socialist countries and of communist parties and other forces of the working-class movement. Leonid Brezhnev stated expressly at the 26th Congress of the CPSU: "They want people to believe that nuclear war can be limited, they want to reconcile them with the idea that such war is permissible.

"But that is sheer deception of the peoples! A 'limited' nuclear war as conceived by the Americans in, say, Europe would from the outset mean the certain destruction of European civilisation. And of course the United States, too, would not be able to escape the flames of war. Clearly, such plans and 'doctrines' are a grave threat to all nations, including the people of the USA. They are being condemned all over the world. The peoples say an emphatic 'No' to them."¹

Scientists have an important part to play in exposing the dangers of a world thermonuclear war. In 1980 a group of prominent US medical scientists addressed a letter to the President of the United States and the Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet categorically condemning the attempts to picture nuclear war as "thinkable". Nuclear war, they said, can end within one hour. The world will be quite different after such a war: colder, harsher and contaminated with radiation for a thousand years. Leonid Brezhnev answered the letter and stressed that he fully shared the authors' concern over the threat of nuclear war. Soviet medical scientists said in a letter to their colleagues in the United States: "The fateful scale and the terrible consequences of a conflict in which the latest weapons may be applied cannot be compared even to what people had to go through in the wars of the 20th century." This is the position of all Soviet scientists.

Indeed, while World War II engulfed 40 countries, killed a total of 50 to 55 million people and left 34 to 35 million wounded (of these, 20 to 25 million crippled for life), a new world thermonuclear war can turn our bright blue Earth into a lifeless planet poisoned by radioactive fallout. In an age of nuclear missiles, a world war is totally unacceptable. It is a dangerous madness to count on victory in a nuclear war. Such is our firm conviction and the starting point of our modern political philosophy with regard to war and peace. The scien-

¹ *Documents and Resolutions*. . . , p. 28.

tific approach to, substantiation and specification of the human right to live in peace—and this lays a firm theoretical foundation for the world peace drive—are among the paramount theoretical and practical accomplishments of Marxism-Leninism.

Bourgeois social science divorces problems of war and peace from the context of social development, approaching them from a metaphysical viewpoint. Wars, it asserts, have always reflected either the “evil innate in man” or “elementary struggle for survival”. Naturally, other ideas have been advanced too, but they were all as far from the truth as the ones quoted.

The authors of the “theories of war” advanced by pre-Marxist philosophy and sociology were, to a large degree, simply deluded. This applies to a much lesser degree to the scholars and politicians who succeeded them and especially to those writing about war today. Now that anyone can use a scientific method and the problem has been researched in depth, one can only pursue one goal by claiming that war reflects “struggle for survival” or “the evil in man”: to prove that mankind can never be rid of wars. Advocates of this view are numerous—above all, at various NATO headquarters and among the related military-industrial interests.

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels were the ones who worked out a truly scientific view of war as a distinct social phenomenon. Developing the doctrine of his predecessors and teachers, Lenin profoundly analysed the wars of the imperialist era. He advanced the human right to peace as a foremost slogan of the socialist revolution.

Exposing the socio-economic, class roots of wars, Marxism-Leninism above all concentrated on an analysis of the possible ways to remove the causes of wars and to secure durable peace. From the very first years of the 20th century Marxists everywhere have focussed their attention on these problems. Suffice it to recall a quotation from Rosa Luxemburg. Recalling Engels’ words about bourgeois society facing a dilemma—either a transition to socialism or a return to barbarity—she wrote in 1915: “A single glance around shows us what this return of bourgeois society to barbarity means. This world war is a return to barbarity. The triumph of imperialism leads to a destruction of culture—sporadic during a modern war and total if the current period of world wars is brought to its logical conclusion. Therefore today we are . . . truly facing a choice: either a triumph of imperialism and a collapse of all culture, like in Ancient Rome—extinction, desolation,

degeneration and a huge graveyard; or a victory of socialism, i.e., conscious struggle by the international proletariat against imperialism and its method, war.”¹

These words reflect both the particular urgency of the task of freeing man from war and the fact that social progress—above all the struggle of the working class against imperialism and for socialism—is the paramount condition for its solution.

Indeed, Marx himself emphasised that “the very conditions of universal peace” consisted in the transformation of “the relations of labour and capital”,² in other words, the proletariat’s victory. Lenin also noted that only the working class can save world culture and mankind from the insanity of imperialist wars.³

Indeed, until the proletariat became mature and powerful enough to oppose imperialism and imperialist military might with its own power and political initiative, there had been virtually no way of effectively solving the problem of war and peace on a world-wide scale.

The First International, already in its first policy document, called on the working class to intervene in world politics and work out its own foreign policy based on peace and friendship among nations, on moral and just principles.⁴

The Paris Commune of 1871, the principles it proclaimed as fundamental to international relations, the powerful movement of worker solidarity with the Paris Commune in most European countries⁵—all that highlighted the great mission of the working class, that of freeing mankind from war.

Nevertheless, prior to 1917, working-class action in European and world politics merely presaged the role the proletariat, having a state of its own, could play in the struggle for peace. The October Revolution was the historical event of global significance which opened totally new, unprecedented opportunities for solving problems of war and peace.

¹ Rosa Luxemburg, *Gesammelte Werke*, Bd. 4, Berlin, 1974, S. 62.

² *The General Council of the First International. 1866-1868. Minutes*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1964, p. 152.

³ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1965, p. 75.

⁴ See Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 2, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, p. 18.

⁵ *The International Working-Class Movement*, Vol. 2, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1981, p. 153-59.

The first country of the victorious working class emerged on the world scene proclaiming peace. Naturally, the Bolsheviks led by Lenin realised that a world-wide victory of socialism would be the best way to ensure durable, even everlasting peace and truly equal and mutually beneficial international co-operation. However, they knew that revolutions cannot be "made to order" or exported: revolutions mature in the heart of social systems, they are carried out by the working class and all working people led by revolutionary parties.

The transformation of societies and international relations on a democratic basis can last an entire historical era. Meanwhile, the task is to search for ways to ensure peace through peaceful coexistence of the two systems. This course was reflected in the foreign policy Soviet Russia proclaimed. In his interview to a Berlin correspondent of an American news agency Lenin said: "What are our plans in Asia? They are the same as in Europe: peaceful coexistence with all peoples, with the workers and peasants of all nations. . ." ¹

The principles of peaceful coexistence became an organic element of Soviet foreign policy literally from the very first hours after the revolution. It is common knowledge that for the first time this course was proclaimed in Lenin's Decree on Peace, adopted by the Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets on November 8, 1917.

Throughout the sixty-odd years since the October Revolution, the course toward preserving and strengthening peace and ensuring stable peaceful coexistence has remained a major element of the programme of the Soviet Communist Party, of Soviet foreign policy. It has been creatively developed and specified at CPSU congresses.

Of major significance in this regard was the 24th Congress of the CPSU held in 1971, which adopted a comprehensively substantiated, profound and realistic Peace Programme. It took into consideration the realities and factors underlying modern international relations and the urgent needs of man's historical development. The programme envisaged a number of important steps to strengthen peace and international security.

The Programme of Further Struggle for Peace and International Co-operation, and for the Freedom and Independence of the Peoples,

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 365.

adopted by the 25th CPSU Congress in 1976, was a continuation and development of the Peace Programme. Proceeding from the ideas advanced in the 1976 programme, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are working steadily to restructure international relations in such a way that they would create appropriate patterns and forms for solving urgent global, continental, regional, multilateral and bilateral problems.

The new USSR Constitution adopted in 1977 includes a special chapter formalising the peaceful essence of Soviet foreign policy. It has raised to the status of national law that which lies at the core of socialist foreign policy—the concern for peace, for creating international relations favourable to the struggle for national liberation and social progress, for socialism and communism.

The realism and effectiveness of any programme are measured against its actual record. Today one can already say with confidence that the Soviet Peace Programme has stood the test of time. All the positive changes in international relations which occurred in the 1970s and were dubbed “detente” were closely connected with the implementation of the Soviet Peace Programme.

However, all through the period when detente was struggling to take its actual shape, the more aggressive of the world reactionary forces were taking steps designed to virtually wreck it. The facts are well-known, and there is hardly any need to quote them here. This is how Leonid Brezhnev summed up these developments in his speech at the luncheon in honour of SPD Chairman Willy Brandt: “What was done in the 70s continues to serve the cause of peace now, too, in the deteriorating international situation. But let’s look at things straight: there is a threat of a new turn now, this time from detente to a new edition of the ‘cold war’.”¹

Opponents of detente usually explain their action by referring to the so-called Soviet military threat. But in actual fact, this threat has never existed. Information on the state of affairs was once again outlined at the 26th CPSU Congress:

“Whether we take strategic nuclear arms or medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, in both instances there is approximate parity between the sides. In respect of some weapons the West has a certain advantage, and we have an advantage in respect of others. This parity

¹ *Pravda*, July 1, 1981.

could be more stable if pertinent treaties and agreements were concluded.

"There is also talk about tanks. It is true that the Soviet Union has more of them. But the NATO countries, too, have a large number. Besides, they have considerably more anti-tank weapons.

"The tale of Soviet superiority in troops strength does not match the facts either. Combined with the other NATO countries, the United States has even slightly more troops than the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty countries.

"So, what talk can there be of any Soviet military superiority?"¹

As a matter of fact, many competent Western experts have repeatedly admitted and admit today that all talk about a "Soviet threat" is completely groundless.

But if there is no "Soviet threat", what explains saber-rattling and war preparations? Our point of view on this question is well-known. Imperialism is progressively losing ground on the world scene, the sphere of its domination is contracting, and capitalist society is deep in crisis. All this prompts the militarist and reactionary quarters in the West to step up the arms race and try to secure military superiority. This reflects the frantic desire to stop or, better still, turn back the clock of history. This is a hopeless venture, but its advocates are perfectly capable of inflicting terrible and irretrievable damage on mankind.

Human history is full of attempts to halt social progress by force of arms, thus extending the life span of capitalism, an obsolete social system. These attempts were still geographically limited only a few decades ago.

Today, the reactionary, aggressive imperialist quarters, above all in the United States, have launched a truly global campaign against socialism, against the communist and the entire liberation movement. The aims of this campaign are in fact being flaunted. Top-level US statesmen openly state their desire to prevent new victories of the liberation movement, let alone the emergence of new socialist-oriented countries. These and similar declarations are compounded by practical action to suppress liberation movements and prepare for war against the USSR and other socialist nations.

In other words, a truly global attempt is now under way to change

¹ *Documents and Resolutions...*, p. 30.

the course of history, extend the life span of capitalism and destroy socialism. Naturally, this attempt is doomed to failure. But if pushed to its logical conclusion, i.e., to nuclear war, it would destroy not only capitalism but also all the fruits of man's age-old civilisation.

Thomas Mann once called anti-communism the greatest folly of the 20th century. Today one can say that anti-communism has also become the gravest and deadliest danger facing mankind.

The only way to save civilisation is to renounce power politics, confrontation and war, to aim at peaceful coexistence. This course enables each social system to demonstrate what it can do for man. Socialism is sure of itself: in conditions of peace it can realise its potential on a comprehensive scale. If the capitalist system is equally sure of itself, it has nothing to fear.

However, it appears that the West—at any rate the United States—is not too confident of success in peaceful competition with socialism. For this or that reason the Western world is striving for confrontation. As a result, tensions have mounted and the world situation has deteriorated abruptly.

Naturally, all kinds of political forces—some with alarm and others with hope—were waiting for the ideas the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community would advance in this situation. They wanted to know whether the response to the West would be “blow for blow” or would take a different path. Aggressive quarters in the United States and some West European countries clearly hoped that the former would be the case. Moreover, they not only hoped but also directly provoked the Soviet Union into taking such steps which would aggravate the situation still more. But their hopes were in vain.

The 26th Congress of the CPSU set forth specific, comprehensive and constructive proposals in favour of peace and detente. *“To safeguard peace—no task is more important now on the international plane for our Party, for our people and, for that matter, for all the peoples of the world”*¹—that was how the Congress identified the chief strategic objective of Soviet foreign policy. Substantiating the new Soviet foreign policy initiatives aimed at removing the war threat and strengthening international security, Leonid Brezhnev said: *“Not war preparations that doom the peoples to a senseless squandering of their*

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. . .*, p. 40.

material and spiritual wealth, but consolidation of peace—that is the clue to the future.”¹

The salient direction of the Soviet Peace Programme for the 1980s is to halt the arms race, keep the world from sliding toward war and prevent war itself.

It is not only that modern warfare threatens the future of mankind, but the arms race as such entails immense adverse consequences.

First, the huge military expenditures, of course. Western estimates put the annual global military appropriations in the first half of the 1970s—obviously, with the NATO countries accounting for a lion’s share—at about 350 billion dollars. In the latter half of the decade the figure rose to 400 billion and, in the early 1980s, has already reached 500 billion dollars, exceeding 10 per cent of the world’s total production. In the latter half of the current decade, annual military expenditures may increase to 600 billion.

Western estimates indicate that over six trillion dollars have been spent on the arms race over the post-war period. This about equals the 1975 world total of gross national product. The property and capital the military-industrial complex of the capitalist world commands today are estimated at 340 billion dollars. About 100 million civilians work for the armed forces directly and in the munitions industry. Besides, approximately 25 million people (seven million more than 20 years ago) serve in the armed forces and produce nothing.

Even a rough calculation shows that the funds spent on military needs would be enough to solve all of the more pressing global problems man is now facing. Karl Marx used to say that military production for a nation was tantamount to tossing a considerable part of its wealth to the wind. This is perfectly true of capitalist society today, but only partly applicable to the socialist world. Of course, socialism does incur great unproductive losses because of the need to develop sufficiently powerful weapons for self-defence. But the point is precisely that they are defensive weapons; their very development is designed to prevent imperialism from pushing the world into a nuclear holocaust. Efforts to create a reliable barrier to power politics, efforts that make recourse to arms pointless and impossible can by right be viewed as an investment into the durable peace mankind needs so badly.

¹ Ibid.

No doubt it would be best to save the resources we and other nations spend on defence for tackling peaceful, creative tasks. This is an important objective of the policy of peace and detente pursued by the Soviet Union. This has been repeatedly reiterated by our party leaders and the Soviet government.

Second, developing countries are being dragged increasingly deeper into the arms race, incurring growing losses. This severely impedes the solution of a major global problem—that of overcoming the colonial legacy of economic backwardness among Asian, African and Latin American countries. This solution is indispensable for normal international relations and for human progress in general. In the 1950s the share of the developing countries in world military expenditures was 4 to 6 per cent. By the early 1970s it reached 15 to 17 per cent and kept growing. Over the two decades from 1950 to 1970 these countries spent 424 billion dollars on armaments.¹

Third, for the developed capitalist nations the arms race acts as a serious drag on economic development, aggravates crisis and inflationary trends, and diminishes domestic consumption and economic growth rates.

The arms race impedes still more the solution of acute socio-economic problems—unemployment, inadequate medical care, education, social security and the like. According to US press reports, a 50-per cent cut in the armed forces and armaments in Central Europe would save 20 to 25 billion dollars, enough to create at least two million new industrial jobs.

Fourth, the arms race and war preparations are a great hindrance in the efforts to tackle the problems of energy and raw materials. War preparations themselves and the giant war machine consume such a great amount of energy and raw materials that even a small reduction of this machine would considerably alleviate the world energy situation and enlarge energy resources.

Fifth, it is obvious that war preparations have commandeered the services of about 25 per cent of the world's scientists. One can easily imagine the enormous benefits these people could produce if they worked for peaceful purposes.

Sixth, one cannot overlook the fact that war preparations, related

¹ A. Migolatyev, *Imperializm i militarizm* (Imperialism and Militarism), Moscow, 1979, p. 57.

experiments and military production considerably damage human health even in peacetime. Nuclear tests in the continental United States (in Nevada), on the atoll Bikini and in some other areas tragically impaired people's health, and the consequences are felt to this day. The development of various bacteriological and chemical weapons undertaken by the US armed forces in the past and carried out on a large scale today is extremely dangerous to the health of both servicemen and civilians.

There is no doubt therefore that while nuclear war threatens the very survival of man, each new round of the arms race creates new and increasingly dangerous obstacles to economic and social progress. Peace and progress are indeed closely interconnected today.

It is very significant that the most consistent and vigorous champions of social progress are the most consistent and vigorous champions of peace.

These are, above all, the socialist countries. "It is absolutely obvious," Leonid Brezhnev said at the 26th CPSU Congress, "that today the Soviet Union and its allies are more than ever the chief buttress of world peace."¹ In this connection one might recall that within a year after the 26th Congress, the CPSU advanced the following new initiatives:

- a proposal (now formalised in a decision by the 36th UN General Assembly) on declaring it a crime against humanity to be the first to use nuclear weapons;

- a set of proposals on turning Europe into a continent free not only from medium-range nuclear weapons but also from tactical nuclear weapons; initially, on considerably reducing the medium-range nuclear weapons deployed in Europe (Soviet-US talks on these problems began in Geneva on November 30, 1981);

- proposals on the resumption of talks on strategic armaments;

- a proposal on banning the deployment of any weapons in outer space (also adopted by the UN General Assembly);

- proposals on turning the Mediterranean into a sea of peace and setting up a nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe;

- proposals on the ways to settle the situation in the Persian Gulf area and, in a broader context, on the fundamentals of relations with the developing Asian and African countries;

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. . .*, p. 7.

—considerations concerning further efforts to settle the Middle East crisis and, specifically, the convening of a conference on the Middle East;

—proposals on strengthening peace in Asia, specifically, on extending military confidence-building measures to Asia.

The foremost task of socialist foreign policy is to safeguard peace. On the one hand, steps taken to reach this objective ensure optimum external conditions for effective socialist and communist construction. On the other hand—and this is extremely important—they create conditions necessary for social progress in the interests of all mankind.

“Our world today,” Leonid Brezhnev said, “is socially heterogeneous—it is made up of states with different social systems. This is an objective fact. By its internal development and by its approach to international relations the socialist part of the world is setting a good example of how the major problems facing mankind can best be solved. But, needless to say, it cannot solve them for the whole of humanity. What is needed is purposeful effort by the people of every country, broad and constructive co-operation by all countries, all peoples. The Soviet Union is whole-hearted in its desire for such co-operation. In this—if one looks deeper—lies the essence of the foreign policy course that we refer to as the policy of peaceful coexistence.”¹

The communist and working-class movement plays a vigorous and effective part in the struggle against the war danger. “The communist and workers’ parties of the European countries,” the final document of the 1976 Berlin Conference noted, “together with the other democratic and peace-loving forces, have played a decisive role in the political actions which made possible a turn towards detente and the strengthening of security and towards co-operation in Europe.”² Today, the communist and workers’ parties focus all their efforts on organising an effective rebuff to the imperialist policy promoting the arms race, built-up tensions and preparations for war with socialist countries.

A typical feature of the contemporary stage in history is the growing involvement of the social-democratic wing of the working-class

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *Our Course: Peace and Socialism*, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1978, p. 187.

² *For Peace, Security, Cooperation and Social Progress in Europe, Berlin, June 29-30, 1976*, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1976, p. 40.

movement in the peace drive. Leonid Brezhnev has noted: "We appreciate the participation by the Social Democrats and Socialists of many countries in the struggle against the arms race, against the nuclear war threat and for more durable peace; and we are always ready to co-operate in this noble effort."¹

If the working-class movement rallies its huge forces together, if the working class in capitalist countries fights for peace with the same vigour it has recently been displaying in asserting its socio-economic demands, one can safely say that this will place an insurmountable barrier in the way of war and aggression.

The considerable differences in the domestic policies of the newly-liberated countries are well known. However, most of them approach foreign policy in a more or less similar way. Above all this refers to their refusal to accept a policy of aggression and arbitrary action from which they themselves have suffered so much. They are also active in the drive to ensure peace and broad international co-operation.

This foreign policy pursued by the newly-free countries is profoundly logical. After all, they are facing enormous economic and social tasks: to assert their political and economic independence, to overcome the age-old colonial legacy of backwardness, to improve the material and cultural conditions of their peoples and introduce them to the benefits of modern civilisation. Obviously, all these tasks can be solved effectively only in conditions of peace based on firm security and broad, peaceful and mutually beneficial co-operation among all nations.

Finally, another salient feature of the current situation is that not only nations and their governments act politically on the issues of war and peace and global problems as a whole. Popular masses and their various organisations are now active in tackling these questions—a very important factor. One cannot fail to note that this increased and better organised peace activity by the masses has contributed significantly to detente.

The vigorous public participation in efforts to solve the problems of war and peace is, of course, the result of historical experience. Recalling the bitter lessons of World War I and World War II and fully aware of the grave dangers posed by a thermonuclear conflict, people are firmly resolved to prevent a new tragedy.

¹ *Pravda*, July 1, 1981.

Apparently, the current rise in the activity of the popular masses is linked to another factor too—to the very nature of our era. Indeed, striking scientific and technological advances have enabled people scattered all over the globe to increasingly realise how close they are to one another and how intricately their destinies are intertwined. Our nuclear age gives rise to new criteria of “my own” and “someone else’s”, to a new feeling of solidarity among different nations in the struggle for peace, to a new sense of responsibility for the world’s future.

I believe that this growing sense of responsibility to ourselves and to future generations will generate powerful action for more durable peace and security and, consequently, for human progress.

INTERNATIONAL PHYSICIANS FOR THE PREVENTION OF NUCLEAR WAR

Academician YEVGENI CHAZOV

Specialises in cardiac therapy, b. 1929. A graduate of Kiev Medical Institute (in 1953), he was elected corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences in 1967, full member in 1971 and member of the Presidium in 1972. Full member of the USSR Academy of Sciences since 1979 and President of the All-Union Cardiological Research Society since 1975, honorary member of the American Heart Association, the Swedish Society of Medical Sciences, the GDR Academy of Sciences and national cardiological societies of Great Britain, Yugoslavia, the GDR, Hungary and Bulgaria. He worked at and served as Director of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences Institute of Cardiology from 1958 to 1967. He has been Deputy Minister of Public Health since 1968 and, simultaneously, chief of the emergency cardiology department at the Institute of Cardiology, founder and General Director (since 1975) of the All-Union Cardiological Research Centre, deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet and President of the Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War Committee established under the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences in July 1981.

Most of Yevgeni Chazov's works are on thromboses, myocardial infarction, metabolism, circulatory insufficiency and other cardiological problems.

The history of medicine abounds in examples showing how selflessly physicians in many countries have fought for the lives and health of millions of people. They have fought against epidemics, infant mortality, tuberculosis, cardiovascular and mental diseases.

People throughout the world have come to see the physician not only as a healer, a practitioner of the most humane profession, but also as a man of integrity and empathy.

People have charged physicians with watching out for anything that might harm human life or health. Medical advice on health hazards is taken very seriously. The Hippocratic oath goes as follows: "The regimen I adopt shall be for the benefit of my patients according to my ability and judgement, and not for their hurt or for any wrong. I will give no deadly drug to any, though it be asked of me, nor will I counsel such... Whatsoever house I enter, there will I go for the benefit of the sick, refraining from all wrongdoings or corruption."

Today nothing poses a graver danger to human life and health than nuclear war. World War II wasted over 50 million lives. The destructive effect of modern nuclear weapons has no analogy in the past. The existing stockpiles of these weapons are so great that a nuclear war, whether launched deliberately or accidentally, through a technical fault or through oversight, can destroy all life on Earth.

The yield of all the currently available nuclear weapons is estimated at 50,000 to 60,000 megatons, the equivalent of 2.5 to 3 million Hiroshima bombs.

What does a million Hiroshimas mean in practical terms? Many people are still not fully aware of the possible consequences of nuclear war. There are army men and even public figures who assert that a nuclear conflagration will incinerate "only 200 million people". Others forecast that a nuclear war will "destroy only half of mankind". Some strategists start discussing the possibility of fighting a "tactical" or "limited" nuclear war; they talk of "demonstration" or "selective" nuclear strikes. Monstrously enough, even some scientists—judging, among other things, by a report of a group of scientists from the US National Academy of Sciences—lend the weight of their views to support such notions. It is as if the survivors could go on living as before the nuclear war—with normal nutrition, the environment intact and without having to cope with unprecedented and extremely complicated medical problems. This illusion must be dispelled.

That is the reason why the proposal Leonid Brezhnev made at the 26th CPSU Congress about setting up an international committee on the nuclear danger is of such great importance for all mankind. He said: "The peoples must know the truth about the destructive consequences which a nuclear war could have for mankind. *We suggest that a competent international committee should be set up, which would demonstrate the vital necessity of preventing a nuclear catas-*

trophe. The committee could be composed of the most eminent scientists of different countries. The whole world should be informed of the conclusions they draw.”¹

Aware of the danger nuclear weapons pose to the health and life of each human being, physicians in many countries raised their voices in resolute protest against the nuclear arms race. In early December 1980 representatives of the US and Soviet medical communities met in Geneva to discuss and reach agreement on the fundamental principles of Physicians for Nuclear Disarmament, an international movement. The United States was represented by Professor Bernard Lown, Dr. Eric Chivian and Dr. James Muller, prominent leaders of this movement in their country, and the Soviet Union, by Yevgeni Chazov, Leonid Ilyin and Mikhail Kuzin, members of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences.

The mission of the movement is to bring home to the world public and the governments of the nuclear powers the danger inherent in the continuing arms race and accumulation of nuclear weapons. A nuclear catastrophe will bring untold sufferings to all nations, killing hundreds of millions within the very first hours and days of the global conflict. It is estimated that a ground explosion of a one-megaton nuclear device in a city with a population of one million will destroy one-third of its inhabitants. The shock wave and the fires will demolish buildings almost throughout the city. There will be no housing, no electricity and no water; food deliveries will be disrupted. Thermal (luminous) radiation will cause third-degree burns even at a distance of 12.5 kilometres from ground zero. Compared to an air explosion a surface blast will produce an additional effect: intensive radioactive contamination due to local fallout—a radioactive “trail”. It has been estimated that this can inflict radiation sickness in varying degrees of severity on tens of thousands of people.

The huge casualties will cause a host of socio-hygienic problems, the emergency treatment of injuries among the most acute. The experience of Hiroshima and Nagasaki shows that a nuclear attack will annihilate 50 to 90 per cent of medical personnel. Those who survive will hardly be able to care adequately for the people injured by the nuclear blast. There will be a shortage of blood plasma, oxygen and medical supplies. Mass outbreaks of contagious diseases are quite pos-

¹ *Documents and Resolutions*. . . , p. 39.

sible among the population weakened by radioactivity, injuries, hunger, the lack of fresh water and excessive psychological stress.

Chaotic migration will carry the diseases to areas far from the site of the nuclear attack too. There is a high risk of epidemics spreading to the regions and continents which suffer no direct nuclear strikes. One cannot forecast any figures as far as this type of consequences of a nuclear catastrophe are concerned. However, the record of previous wars indicates that the losses through epidemics can exceed combat casualties by 200 to 400 per cent.

Moreover, discussions of the nuclear war-related problems often overlook or possibly sometimes even deliberately ignore the global ecological impact of a nuclear strike. Aside from the heavy damage in areas close to ground zero, global changes can result which will harm the health and lives of people living even comparatively far from the sites of nuclear explosions.

Although the study of the ways radiation affects biogeocenoses has discovered a number of laws in peacetime, all-out nuclear war can cause new changes in the biosphere in terms of both quantity and quality. Different degrees of resilience to ionising radiation can upset the currently homeostatic and balanced environment. This, in turn, will cause some species to disappear and others,—for example, the lower types of various micro-organisms—to breed unchecked. Today it is impossible to predict the consequences of such environmental imbalance.

The radioactive products of nuclear explosions will enter the stratosphere and then migrate gradually over the globe. And if there is an explosion, say, in the Northern Hemisphere, about one-third of the fallout will be deposited to the south of the equator. Radioactive biological chains will spring up on the ground, in the water and in the air.

Let us consider several examples. A nuclear blast can scatter radioactive iodine-31 over rather large areas. Through vegetation it can be transmitted to fodder and, through milk, to humans (above all, children), causing intensive irradiation of the thyroid.

The more stable products of a nuclear explosion—strontium-90 and cesium-137—will migrate along biological chains for a long time, subsequently entering the human body and building up deposits in bone and muscle. It takes the stratosphere about 12 months to cleanse itself of half the radioactive products.

Other global consequences of nuclear warfare include climatic ef-

fects. Foremost among them is the destruction of the ozone layer, one to two kilometres thick, which protects the surface of the Earth, vegetation, animals and humans from the hard component of ultraviolet radiation. High-yield nuclear explosions generate huge amounts of nitrogen oxides. Some estimates indicate that a one-megaton air blast produces about 10,000 tons of nitrogen oxides. Photochemical reactions of nitrogen oxides with ozone will destroy the ozone layer and lay the Earth bare to a huge stream of hard ultraviolet radiation. This will disrupt the vegetative system of plants and harm people by causing burns which can produce malignant skin diseases. Destruction of the ozone layer by a nuclear explosion poses an extremely important and urgent problem.

Certain estimates indicate that all the nuclear tests conducted so far (of a total yield of about 530 megatons) have reduced the ozone concentration in the protective layer by three to five per cent.

Several foreign experts expect the detonation of nuclear devices with a combined yield of about 10,000 megatons to destroy 30 to 50 per cent of the ozone layer. This means that no matter where nuclear weapons strike, the concentration of ozone in the atmosphere will change and bring about the consequences listed above. One should expect nuclear weapons to produce other global effects too. The general conclusion is as follows: a massive nuclear strike will affect, to different degrees, all countries and territories.

Discussing the consequences of the arms race and the expansion of nuclear arsenals, the US and Soviet representatives of the medical community agreed at their Geneva meeting that the nuclear arms race already costs man too much. Among other things, this refers to the considerable psychological damage caused by the anxiety in various countries over the threat of nuclear war. Nervous and psychological tensions easily lead to stress conditions which affect human health.

The arms race consumes the resources needed for humanitarian purposes, including medical problems. The efforts of many scientists, engineers and workers, billions of dollars, rare and non-renewable natural resources are being used up to manufacture nuclear weapons and their delivery means. Vast resources are being spent for war while millions are afflicted by hunger and disease.

In the developing countries, 400 million people are chronically hungry, 300 million suffer from anemia, 100 million children risk death because of malnutrition and vitamin deficiency, 30 per cent of the

children do not go to school. World military expenditures are 20 to 25 times the total amount of aid the developed nations extend to the developing countries. Here are a few figures. Over the past decade, the World Health Organisation (WHO) has spent about 182 million dollars to wipe out smallpox, less than the cost of a single modern strategic bomber. WHO estimates that the eradication of malaria, a disease affecting over a billion people in 66 countries, will require 450 million dollars—one-third of the cost of an Ohio-type nuclear submarine.

Effective use of the oceans' food and mineral resources, development of fundamentally new energy sources, control over the environmental factors dangerous to human health, eradication of diseases and illiteracy—these urgent problems represent only some of the fields where the knowledge and resources squandered on military development could be used.

In the course of their meetings and discussions, the US and Soviet physicians arrived at a unanimous view that a vigorous drive against the arms race and for nuclear disarmament was in order. They hold that this movement must become international and that scientists in many countries will surely join it.

The contribution of scientists to the struggle for nuclear disarmament, for a ban on nuclear weapons is well known. The Pugwash Movement has played a prominent part in that. Still, physicians, the group of professionals known for their dedication to human life and health and commanding the most extensive knowledge about the tragic consequences of nuclear war, can be particularly effective in the effort to prevent this war. Such is the major point formulated at the international congress of physicians held near Washington, D. C., in March 1981.

That was the first Congress of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, attended by representatives of 11 countries, including a Soviet delegation. The documents the Congress adopted reflected the profound concern of the medical community over the continued arms race. This international forum approved appeals to Leonid Brezhnev and President Reagan, to the physicians of the world, to the heads of all governments and to the United Nations. They urged that the highest priority be given to averting the danger of nuclear war. Congress delegates advocated the establishment of an international organisation to co-ordinate the efforts of various national medical associations working to prevent nuclear war.

Professor Lown of Harvard University put it very well when he said: "Physicians charged with responsibility for the lives of their patients and the health of the community must begin to explore a new province of preventive medicine, the prevention of nuclear war." In this regard it is very important for physicians to try and change the situation when the public underestimates the danger of nuclear weapons, when it is claimed that the use of certain types of nuclear weapons would not cause serious damage and would spare property.

For example, some Western military and political figures advertise neutron weapons, the full-scale manufacture of which was ordered by President Reagan in August 1981. The main destructive effect of this sophisticated type of nuclear weapons is connected with neutron radiation which causes leukemia and death. The claims by the advocates of these weapons to the effect that they will affect only enemy troops and not civilians are totally groundless and designed for the uninformed. A one-kiloton neutron bomb will form a zone of absolutely lethal radiation within a radius of 1,200 metres from ground zero—4.5 square kilometres. Over an area of 15 square kilometres, people will receive a dose of radiation which will very likely cause them malignant tumours and genetic changes in their descendants. Add to that the high population density and short distances separating urban areas in many countries. Another factor to be stressed is that neutron weapons are not at all "clean" radiation-wise. Capable of inducing radioactivity in stable elements, neutrons will turn the soil, food and various objects, especially those made of metal, within the strike area into sources of gamma and beta radiation by activating their constituent elements.

Nations and governments throughout the world should be made well aware of what a nuclear war can bring mankind. We must shatter the illusion that countries can survive a nuclear war with their social, administrative and economic systems intact, that a nuclear war and its consequences can be confined to a certain number of specially selected areas, that nuclear war is winnable, that the public health system will be able to cope with the problems of treating the sick, the wounded and those injured by burns in the wake of a nuclear attack. The international forum of physicians which gave rise to the new movement Physicians for Nuclear Disarmament recognised that informing world public opinion of the true scope of the danger implicit in nuclear weapons was a task of the utmost importance in the drive to limit and subsequently ban nuclear weapons.

The Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War Congress of FRG physicians, held in Hamburg in September 1981, was another indication of the alarm people all over the world felt at the growing threat of a nuclear catastrophe. This forum was attended by over 1,500 medical researchers and practicing physicians, many medical students and foreign delegations, including prominent scientists from Great Britain, the Netherlands, the Soviet Union and other countries. We must use all the power of our knowledge, Professor Richter declared, to resist the situation when the madness of the arms race is presented as a normal state of affairs and even a necessity. Professor Linden spoke on the danger of neutron weapons. An "atomic duel" would mean death to Europe, retired general Gert Bastian stressed in his report to the Congress. Denouncing Washington's "new nuclear strategy", retired vice admiral John Marshall Lee of the United States said that nuclear war could not be limited, that it threatened mankind with extinction and should therefore be prevented. In its final document, the Hamburg Congress came out in favour of revoking the NATO decision to station new US medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe and for strengthening the unity of physicians in the drive toward peace.

In November 1981 a group of Italian medical scientists called on their colleagues throughout the country to join and vigorously participate in the struggle against the nuclear arms race. Their ultimate aim is convening in Italy a representative international conference of physicians and biologists for peace, detente and disarmament.

One cannot imagine a more terrible disaster than a world nuclear war. No preventive effort must be spared to save man from it. Nuclear weapons must be destroyed before they destroy man.

WAR, POLITICS, DETENTE

DETENTE'S DIFFICULT PATHS

VALENTIN FALIN

An expert in international law, b. 1926. He began as a metal worker at the Krasny Proletary factory in Moscow, in 1942-1945, went to the Moscow Institute of International Relations, graduated in 1950, and worked at the USSR Foreign Ministry in 1952-1958 and 1959-1970 and in the CPSU Central Committee in 1958-1959. He was Soviet ambassador to the FRG from 1970 to 1978, and has been First Deputy Chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Information Department since 1978. He is member of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission, deputy of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, chairman of its Foreign Affairs Commission, Vice-President of the USSR-FRG Friendship Society and member of the Bureau of the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament.

Most of his works are on international relations and Soviet foreign policy.

Vissarion Belinsky once said that a word is either an idea or an empty sound. But there are words that express more than merely an idea. These are words denoting concepts and principles, reflecting philosophies and programmes of social groups and parties.

"Detente" has recently become such a word, with a place of its own among them. It has become the subject of heated debates, a yardstick against which nations' intentions and actual deeds and politicians' declarations are measured.

There are good reasons for that: we live in an era unique in material and social terms. Nations are solving an equation where all elements are known. As far as the most important question, to be or not

to be, is concerned, it is clear in advance what will happen if governments neglect their responsibility and plunge the world into a thermonuclear holocaust. It is also clear in advance that our planet will not survive for long the plunder of its natural resources, the new grave injuries still inflicted on the soil and the sea, the atmosphere and the ionosphere.

Let us consider the following. Over the first seven decades of the 20th century the world has used up more minerals and energy than over its entire previous history. More specifically, our century's wars and war preparations alone have probably consumed more resources than man had spent over the previous millennia.

What can one call this? What right do those living today have to squander the riches belonging to our descendants too and forming the material basis of our civilisation which did not spring up a moment ago and is not to end today? Why do many governments, political parties and economic interests still proceed in their actions from the philosophy of *après nous le déluge*? Is man really an incorrigible and innately greedy egoist who refuses to think why he values himself higher than anyone else, why he puts his own interests, misconstrued interests at that, above those of his own children and grandchildren, why he destroys, poisons and maims his environment?

Experts have calculated that by the year 2000, as compared to 1975, the world population will have grown by 50 per cent. The per capita average of cultivated land will be 0.25 instead of 0.4 hectare. Water supply will run into greater difficulties. The oilfields will be half exhausted. As much as 40 per cent of the forests the developing countries had in the late 1970s will have been felled. There are forecasts to the effect that over the coming two decades 15 to 20 per cent (about 500,000) of plant and animal species will disappear.

There is no need to go on with this grim list to realise the scope and complexity of these problems. They have one thing in common: none of them can be solved by force of arms, through international confrontation. The interests of nations make it imperative to pool, not scatter, efforts, they call for understanding, not collision. The rational and the humanitarian must override instincts and reflexes rooted in constant fear.

Realities demand that nations exercise understanding and co-operation. The computer age we live in means not only the constantly increasing complexity of technology and equipment but, first and fore-

most, the growing complexity of social phenomena, the increasingly close interpenetration of interests. Common standards are being worked out with regard to the environment, the World Ocean and its resources, as well as common principles of international relations; world economic relations are taking a new shape; and a world science is emerging.

Man is using technology ever more intensively, and this technology itself implies peace as a necessary condition of its safe use. Nuclear reactors, both for commercial and for research purposes, many types of chemical production, certain methods of mineral extraction—these are only some of the examples of how closely peace and progress, peace and prosperity have already merged.

Science, technology and industry continuously reappraise and renew their ideas and their actual implementation. Take the well-known Siemens concern: today it owes half its turnover to products which were not on its inventory a mere five years ago.

But do social consciousness and politics keep up with the rapid changes in the material world? Answers to such questions invariably arise amid the rivalry of opposites, the antagonism of the old and the new. The rise of detente was no exception.

Let us recall a few episodes in the difficult recognition of what now seems to be indisputable.

World War II was not yet fully over, its ashes still hot and the ink of the signatures under solemn obligations to maintain peace still fresh when Washington launched preparations for the cold war designed to establish America's domination over the world. The Pentagon worked feverishly on detailed plans for a nuclear attack on the Soviet Union. The recent ally in the anti-nazi coalition and in the war with militarist Japan was now seen as an obstacle to the United States' hegemony. The task was to remove this obstacle at any cost.

Nuclear diplomacy, a strategy of brinkmanship and a massive arms race were thrown into action. Military blocs were set up, hundreds of military bases encircled the Soviet Union, armed conflicts were provoked and human lives wasted on a great scale. Still, Washington failed to secure a Pax Americana. Imperialism proved incapable of reversing history.

Having staked on sapping the strength of other countries by the cold war and the threats to escalate it into actual warfare, the United States began, by the late 1960s, to feel itself the burden of this pointless

course. The United States was no longer strategically invulnerable, the way it had been in the past, when this invulnerability had enabled it to interfere in the affairs of other countries with relative impunity and encouraged its reckless imperial ambitions. It turned out that the United States was not all-powerful, that it had to learn to accept compromise and concessions, respect views and rights other than its own, and develop a taste for patience and flexibility. Admittedly, Washington's politicians were struck somewhat belatedly by the revelation that America was not necessarily the centre of the Universe. Still, it came, almost as inevitably as the church exonerated Galileo three and a half centuries after he had been convicted by the Inquisition for denying that the Earth was the centre of the Universe.

May 1972 appeared to be a turning point in international developments. The summit meeting in Moscow, Leonid Brezhnev stressed, opened "the way for a transition in Soviet-American relations from confrontation to detente, normalisation and mutually beneficial co-operation".¹ The two leaders signed the Basic Principles of Relations Between the Soviet Union and the United States. This historic document said the sides "will proceed from the common determination that in the nuclear age there is no alternative to conducting their mutual relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence".² The United States and the Soviet Union undertook an obligation to settle their differences peacefully, avoid military confrontation and practise restraint in their relations. The two leaders proclaimed that "differences in ideology and in the social systems of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. are not obstacles to the bilateral development of normal relations based on the principles of sovereignty, equality, non-interference in internal affairs and mutual advantage".³ The principle of equal security of the sides was adopted as a basis in limiting the arms race and bringing down the level of military confrontation.

In June 1973 several new accords were reached on various aspects of Soviet-American co-operation. Foremost among them were the Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War and the Basic Principles of Negotiations on the Further Limitation of Strategic Offensive

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 302.

² *New Times*, No. 23, 1972, p. 39.

³ *Ibid.*

Arms. The Agreement was designed to create conditions which would diminish and ultimately remove the danger of a nuclear war anywhere. The aim of the Basic Principles was to identify the parameters of a future treaty which, logically extending and developing the Interim Agreement on Certain Measures with Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (the SALT-1 Treaty), signed at the May 1972 summit, was to provide a solid and reliable basis for the entire joint Soviet-American effort to stabilise the world military and political situation; it was to help the two sides translate into reality their proclaimed readiness for reconciliation.

Perhaps it was precisely the fundamental importance of the incipient change which was the reason behind the abruptly stepped-up activity, from mid-1973, on the part of those opponents of detente in the United States of America, in the West in general, who had always resisted it as a thoroughly fallacious policy. However, while they had originally hoped that detente would reach an impasse by itself, this time they decided on an all-out direct attack.

For all their obvious differences, the situation resembled 1945 and 1963. In the wake of World War II the more aggressive group in the US leadership betrayed the cause of the anti-nazi coalition, a cause for which tens of millions had died. The Yalta and Potsdam agreements were wrecked: the United States no longer observed them or tried to interpret them in a way which had nothing to do with their meaning and mission. The very idea of co-operation with the Soviet Union, a communist country, was denounced as heresy, while President Franklin D. Roosevelt and other wartime US leaders were almost branded as traitors.

Perhaps the legend claiming FDR had not died a natural death persisted for so long because his death was not only the death of a man: it also killed a policy. Those who succeeded him did their utmost to denigrate and erode his political legacy. As though foreseeing the subsequent turn of events, Roosevelt warned in his last message to Congress that the United States must discharge the obligations it had contracted under the decisions of the anti-nazi coalition or accept the responsibility for a new global catastrophe. Harry S. Truman and his administration refused to heed this advice. They succumbed to the dream of "world leadership for America", of "rolling back communism".

Perhaps the truth about President Kennedy's assassination is kept

so securely under wraps because it was a purely political crime, no matter who was the actual killer. Many well-informed people in the United States believe that John F. Kennedy signed his own death sentence when, speaking at the University of Washington in June 1963, he voiced the "outrageous" opinion that it was time to reappraise the United States' place in today's world and arrive at realistic conclusions with regard to the nation's policy.

The prospects of renouncing a hostile position vis-à-vis the Soviet Union, of ending the US aggression in Vietnam, of any steps toward normalising relations with Cuba—all this was obviously out of place in the then US political climate. The ultraconservative elite preferred the vicious circle of warlike anti-communism and America's exclusiveness.

Or take the political demise of Richard Nixon. Was Watergate really the cause? After all, America had witnessed numerous Watergates, big and small, in the 20th century, but the culprits had always emerged relatively unscathed. Nixon's aides claim that the President fell into a clever CIA trap. We might never know whether this was true. Nevertheless, there is no question that Nixon's exit amid a scandal pleased those powerful US quarters who disapproved not of the methods but of the essence of his presidency, above all of his foreign policy.

Having accepted the principles of peaceful coexistence, having agreed to curb the arms race in the key sphere of strategic weapons, Richard Nixon encroached on the most revered principle of the American way of life—the cult of force. On the other hand, his situation was aggravated by a severe military setback the United States suffered in Indochina, which, naturally, did little to raise US prestige in the eyes of those who lived on Washington's sufferance.

Experts will have a hard time trying to understand what did change in the United States after Nixon as far as guarantees against new Watergates are concerned. But the changes in US policy brought about by the change in the White House was obvious. Gerald Ford, the man Nixon "chose" as his successor, immediately started dismantling detente as a way of political thinking. Trying to please the right wing, he deleted detente from his election vocabulary in the 1976 campaign. This inevitably led to the next logical step: the almost ready SALT-2 Treaty was sacrificed to the military-industrial complex and anti-communist prejudice.

Gerald Ford lost the election. Jimmy Carter, his rival, promised a cut in military spending, social benefits and attention to the needs of the underprivileged, the oppressed and the unemployed. That was deliberate deception for, as Carter himself admitted later, even before his inauguration he was concerned not with disarmament or cutting the military budget but with stepping up the arms race and boosting military expenditures.

Lulling the ill-informed and gullible with tales about "human rights", Carter kept launching new militarist programmes. Going back on his pre-election promise to cut down military appropriations, he raised them to an astronomical level of 180 billion dollars (against 98.3 billion in 1976) by the end of his term. He revived the demand about the United States recapturing its role of a "world leader". He and his team-mates devised new doctrines, directives and guidelines for the old imperial ambitions of the United States.

No wonder Jimmy Carter refused to reiterate the principle of peaceful coexistence in the joint statement on the outcome of the Soviet-American summit in Vienna in June 1979. The farce his administration staged over the ratification of the SALT-2 Treaty was not entirely unexpected either: literally on the next day after its signing the President and members of his cabinet started erecting insurmountable barriers to its approval by the Senate.

One should not oversimplify things and make believe as though the monopolies and the military-industrial complex reign supreme in the United States to the extent that US Presidents merely run errands for them. Presidents can affect US domestic and foreign policies, and quite substantially too. This is borne out by quite convincing evidence. But another thing is equally true. The defense of monopoly interests is rooted in the multistage screening of candidates for important government posts, in the financial stage management of election campaigns, in the absolute sway of big capital in the media and the ample opportunities for manipulating public opinion. If one safeguard fails, another takes its place, and there is always an emergency procedure to deal with an unforeseen situation. The rule remains that in case of conflict between the President and monopoly capital, between the executive authority and the military-industrial complex, presidents have always been on the losing side, except when they were rescued temporarily by rivalries within the financial and industrial oligarchy.

Having listed these reservations, one can safely say that Carter the sanctimonious worked hard to pay back his debt to those who had propelled him from obscurity to the highest post in the United States. Jimmy Carter was to put an end to the policy of detente. Detente was to be sealed off by a wall of mistrust, disillusionment and pessimism. Instincts were to be awakened in the man in the street encouraging him to rely more on muscle than on reason.

Few presidents ever reached the end of a four-year term with a record as poor as Jimmy Carter's. Not a single promise kept. Everything worse than before. But, it turns out, politics resembles the stock exchange: depreciation of some shares can raise the price of others. Americans were told that all their troubles were the fault of an unpredictable President and his incompetent advisers. But not entirely: the chief culprits were the Soviet Union and its friends who "did the United States wrong". Carter and his ilk were blamed for America's "helplessness" before the challenge it was facing. Each day and each hour public opinion is being prompted to conclude that communism is at the heart of all that is wrong in the world, that the Soviet Union's conversion to the American way of thinking is indispensable for preventing war, that unquestioning and universal acceptance of America's leadership will solve all problems, that this demand should be given priority, and not some trifles like detente or peaceful coexistence.

Only time will tell what the seeds sown by Carter and his administration will produce. They did all they could to revive the cold war atmosphere, to promote international discord. Let us now look at what they accomplished. Even American experts admit that national security had become less reliable. Opinion polls demonstrate that almost two-thirds of the Americans are aware of the need to search for a better security basis than piling up weapons and are in favour of continuing the SALT talks with the Soviet Union. These opinion poll results are especially striking if one considers the way people in the United States are psychologically browbeaten by unprecedented anti-communist, anti-Soviet and chauvinist propaganda. One can almost see it as a sign of hope.

Ronald Reagan had a chance to open his Presidential record by starting a fruitful political dialogue with the Soviet Union and other countries in the interests of strengthening peace. The constructive initiatives advanced by the 26th Congress of the CPSU invited him to the negotiating table to settle all disputes, to compare each country's

views, assessments and positions on the topical issues of today—to do it with cards on the table and not by blind guesswork.

World public opinion wanted to believe that Ronald Reagan as head of an administration could differ from Ronald Reagan as Presidential candidate, the way a United States busy with its everyday tasks differed from a United States artificially inflamed by pre-election rhetoric. No one, including the United States, could benefit from increased dangers which inevitably accompany the arms race, saberrattling and other techniques of power politics.

But the picture Washington presents proves yet again that governments can and do make different and even opposite conclusions from the same objective precepts. As Leonid Brezhnev emphasised in the report to the 26th Party Congress, *"To safeguard peace—no task is more important now on the international plane for our Party, for our people and, for that matter, for all the peoples of the world."*¹ Spokesmen of the new US Administration, however, are aiming not at easing international tensions or encouraging positive developments in the political, economic and military spheres but at forcing the international community to accept decisions the US ruling class considers expedient and profitable, irrespective of the consequences. The President and his aides flaunt their refusal to reckon with anyone. They find it useless and harmful to disguise American ambition.

Informed observers note that the White House reacted to the Soviet Peace Programme for the 1980s with annoyance and that the first impulse was to reject the call for a dialogue out of hand. It was only under the pressure from the allies, neutral and developing countries that Ronald Reagan and Secretary of State Alexander Haig decided to manoeuvre and ask for a time out ostensibly because of the complexity of today's international situation. Originally they said it would take the United States six to nine months to sort out the legacy left by their predecessors and work out an approach of their own. They are still at it now, a year later.

But clearly, that is not the point. Note that the new administration says it needs a breathing spell only to contemplate decisions benefiting the world community as a whole. Meanwhile, facts show that from the very start it has been perfectly sure which steps it would take to

¹ *Documents and Resolutions...*, p. 40.

bring about dangerous and long-term distortions in world development.

Not a single proposal has been advanced even indirectly implying that the United States would be prepared to live in peace with others and behave in a civilised way. At the same time, as the Associated Press reported, the Reagan Administration considered about 450 military programmes within the first two months in power. Decisions have been taken on many of them, making the arms race appear still more hopeless.

Priority attention is accorded to the development of radically new weapons systems. Work is accelerated on laser, space and other new types of armaments. Efforts are under way to produce a new generation of chemical weapons and accumulate bacteriological agents. Special emphasis is laid on the development of first-strike weapons. In August 1981, on the anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, the President ordered full-scale manufacture of neutron weapons.

Additional funds were requested for these programmes in the 1980/1981 fiscal year (6.8 billion dollars), while military appropriations for the coming fiscal year were set at 218.8 billion. In the fiscal year 1983 the figure will reach 263 billion dollars.

One might inquire why the administration is taking steps that will surely aggravate world issues if it has not yet arrived at a definite approach to them. Perhaps it would be more logical to assume that opposition to detente has already become the core of the new US policy. Spokesmen of the current administration argue that a "fundamental reappraisal" of Washington's policy is inevitable. Others, like Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, maintain that the reassessment has already occurred and that within the foreseeable future the United States will escalate the arms race instead of negotiating its limitation.

Facts force high-level US leaders to admit that there is no emergency. In his interview to the French television Antenne 2 on February 23, 1981 Secretary of State Alexander Haig noted the current approximate parity in strategic forces between the Soviet Union and the United States: "I think, basically, most of the experts accept that we are at a point of relative balance and equivalence." Approximate balance is preserved between the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO. Even Caspar Weinberger who is more bellicose spoke about

the US-Soviet nuclear equilibrium at a conference on national security in mid-July.

That is the reason why myths are invented about Soviet "intentions", the "increasingly aggressive" Soviet policy and certain "dangerous trends". In the interview quoted above Alexander Haig referred to the grave concern "that in a very brief period, perhaps by the middle of this coming decade, that equality will shift rapidly to Soviet superiority".

It is a perfect case of faulty logic, for if a trend does arise it can be checked by concluding a treaty which would help regulate developments. Actually, that was what the SALT-2 Treaty was all about: it was to impose quantitative and qualitative ceilings on this extremely dangerous competition. The Soviet proposal of a moratorium on medium-range weapons in Europe serves the same end.

Rejecting this type of settlement, US leaders are not concerned with preserving the equilibrium. They do not act in response to "dangerous trends" from abroad. And here Caspar Weinberger is outspoken enough. At the July conference he said: "A US military strategy for the 1980s must begin with our national interests, recognize the threat and be designed to counter it. I believe the national security objectives issued in my recent defense guidance support this basic aim. There we said:

"We will prevent the coercion of the United States, its allies and friends.

"We will be capable of protecting US interests and US citizens abroad.

"We will maintain access to critical resources around the globe, including petroleum.

"We will oppose the geographic expansion of Soviet control and military presence worldwide, particularly where such presence threatens our geostrategic position.

"We will encourage long-term political and military changes within the Soviet empire that will facilitate building a more peaceful and secure world order."

One can hardly be more straightforward. According to Weinberger, the United States intends to "protect US interests and US citizens abroad" by any means available, including by force of arms, and to "oppose the expansion of Soviet control" without stopping at interference in the internal affairs and mutual relations of the socialist coun-

tries. This is to "encourage" long-term changes to the detriment of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community.

The example of Poland shows what practical shape this can take. Various political, economic, misinformation and propaganda steps, joint ideological intervention by external and domestic reactionaries are used to destabilise the situation in the country. Then "mass outbreaks" are instigated against the authorities who are allegedly incapable of ensuring the "normal functioning" of public institutions. The country is pushed into anarchy and chaos, into economic collapse, paralysis of the judiciary and disruption of the constitutional system in general. Then the question of the structure of government, of changing the system and overthrowing socialism is put on the agenda—in this case, so as to wrench Poland away from the political, military and economic system of the socialist community.

Washington's shrill response to the introduction of martial law in Poland is caused by the annoyance at the failure to "encourage long-term political and military changes" which Weinberger referred to. At the last moment, the operation which it had taken so long to prepare fell through. The stakes seem to have been very high if the United States claims that sovereign action by the Polish authorities threatens peace with almost "fatal consequences". It appears that the conspiracy against socialist Poland was to signal the start of perhaps the biggest imperialist effort to wreck peace since World War II.

It is therefore not a matter of military balance, but rather of Washington's refusal to accept the principle of equality as a fundamental element of international relations, the only one underlying world peace. A society to which genuine equality is alien, which reacts to demands of social justice as though they were a mortally dangerous challenge to its way of life is apparently not yet ready to understand the changes the world has gone through over the past decades. Inertia crushes the incipient realism, extreme conservatism allows only an obsolete view of the world. In other words, the sickness affecting the United States as a system built on violence, on the domination of the weak by the strong, on disdain for the interests of the exploited majority is pictured as an advantage other nations should emulate.

One should look for the "dangerous trends" Alexander Haig mentioned not in the intentions ascribed to the Soviet Union but in the actions of the United States and some of its allies and fellow-travellers,

in Washington's frantic desire to turn the Earth, the seas, the atmosphere and outer space into a scene of uncompromising confrontation in which, as former President Nixon said recently, there can be no draw. "Dangerous trends" are rooted in the United States' ambition to act with impunity as the supreme judge in worldly and spiritual matters.

Unlike the United States, the Soviet Union does not seek military superiority and is ready, as before, to confirm this in documents and by specific action. The Soviet military doctrine is strictly defensive. A nation harbouring aggressive designs would not propose renunciation of the first use of nuclear and conventional weapons.

The United States is rearming itself. The aim, as explained by Weinberger, is the ability to fight a war of any scope and intensity in any area at all, to fight several wars simultaneously. There will be no more Vietnams, Washington asserts. It is not a promise to refrain from new adventures, stemming from the outcome of the aggression in Indochina. It is an expression of the resolve to fight a war to the end once it has been started, "not to let victory slip", to make nations fear the United States.

Putting various constructions on the concept of military superiority, the new US leaders talk about creating a "safety margin" for the country's military might. Should it be 2-, 3- or 5-fold? The bigger the better.

However, serious experts believe that today no nation can secure an overwhelming military superiority. The United States, too, is incapable of creating a situation where it could act arbitrarily with impunity.

A fallacious objective produces a fallacious policy. But today's world is such that it is increasingly difficult for some members of the international community to offset the fallacious policy of others by constructive action, especially if the most powerful country of the capitalist system takes the wrong path.

Consequently, for all the hopelessness of the course aimed at securing military superiority, one cannot make believe—and make others believe—that nothing alarming is happening. True, life is the best of teachers. However, it is also true that one cannot rely on people and societies to educate themselves. If the other side does not develop a course of training discouraging the students from adventures, such adventures will begin.

There is no doubt that adventures—and large-scale adventures at that—are in preparation. Take the crusade the US administration has declared on “international terrorism”. Let us translate this deliberately vague slogan into the language of practical politics.

For several decades US imperialism used the disguise of the Alliance for Progress. Today, “charity” has been dismissed from the arsenal of techniques designed to adapt the world to Washington’s tastes. It is now declared for all to hear that from now on it will be the United States who will decide whether any step by any nation in its internal or foreign affairs is justified. Only the changes the United States considers acceptable from the point of view of its political, military or economic interests will be allowed.

But if some changes displease Washington they will be classed as “terrorist” and will entail whatever steps the US government sees fit to take. It has already been announced that America’s leaders will resist vigorously such “products of international terrorism” as national liberation movements, democratic initiatives and demonstrations, and the choice of socialist orientation.

Carter’s imperious warning—that the United States would not tolerate another Iran—took the shape of a naval armada in the western Indian Ocean, a half dozen new military bases in the Middle East and in Africa, the rapid deployment force and the doctrine of American *Lebensraum*. Ronald Reagan is no plagiarist. He holds that a show of respect for human rights and grumbling at dictatorships is pointless and even harmful. It is time to show one’s true colours and raise counter-revolution to the status of national policy.

The White House is warning that the attempts to cauterise the social “heresy” in El Salvador are only a sample of what is to come. The United States openly proclaims a course aimed at interfering in the affairs of Poland and other socialist countries, extending military assistance to the anti-government forces in Afghanistan, Angola, Libya and all countries that have in some way displeased US leaders.

The way Washington thinks and acts often discourages even the most enthusiastic advocates of all things American. Questions are asked in the capitals of Western Europe and the developing world about the course the new US leaders are taking and the ultimate objectives they pursue. Blatantly high-handed discourtesy is not merely a sign of bad manners or political ignorance. It hints at some other, more dan-

gerous qualities. It is not merely nihilism to assert that Ronald Reagan's arrival at the White House opens a new era, as though the history of international relations should be scrapped and started from scratch. We are witnessing attempts by a comparatively small group of people wielding, however, considerable power to consign to oblivion the main lessons mankind has learned from the two world wars and post-war developments. They would like to reinstate war, including nuclear war, as an instrument of policy. And they are honing this tool.

Against the glaring absence of its own ideas objectively serving international understanding, the new administration has managed, within a short time, to discredit everything nations, including the United States, have achieved jointly over the past decade. It is declared that the 1972 treaty on curbing anti-ballistic missile systems and its 1974 protocol will be of interest to the United States only until it develops a more effective technology than the one it had at the time these documents were signed. But the treaty was concluded as an obligation each side assumed for an indefinite period.

The SALT-1 Treaty is being attacked openly. One is given to understand that the United States intends to disregard this treaty—which opened the way to the limitation of strategic offensive armaments—as soon as America acquires weapons systems that will, in Washington's view, enable it to continue negotiations, if they continue at all, from positions of strength.

The United States does not regard the 1973 Soviet-American agreement on the prevention of nuclear war as an obstacle to the propaganda of "expedient" and "possible" use of nuclear weapons to "protect US interests". It is not denied that US plans envisage the use of nuclear weapons in regional conflicts, not necessarily against a nuclear power. The much-advertised "double safeguards" allegedly adopted to rule out unauthorised use of US nuclear weapons are, it appears, worth very little in crisis situations. In an emergency, commanders of US nuclear submarines are authorised to take independent decisions on the launching of nuclear missiles if radio contact with the main centres is lost.

Attacks have been stepped up against proposals on creating nuclear-free zones, on refraining from the deployment of nuclear weapons in regions currently free of them, on renouncing the first use of these weapons. No additional explanations are needed to show that extolling

the "advantages" of nuclear war does nothing to help in the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons or to reduce the risk of an accidental nuclear conflict.

The scornful approach the United States displays is not confined to US-Soviet relations. Earlier agreements with Canada and some other allies are being questioned too. The Reagan Administration refused to sign the Convention on the Law of the Sea which it took over 150 countries several years to complete. Washington summarily demanded that the conference on the Indian Ocean be delayed; that conference was to consider ways to reduce military activity in that region. One can see that international initiatives and negotiations designed to uphold peaceful coexistence and keep detente alive are hit hardest.

One could continue to analyse, point by point, the declarations and the actual steps of the US leaders who are turning their country away from detente, understanding and peace to the slippery brink of war. The captains of US imperialism now at the helm are throwing overboard tried, tested and generally accepted rules and principles. Law is replaced by arbitrary action that has no precedent in the past—at least, over the past two decades. The worse, the better—such is the motto of the politicians who shape US policy today.

The attitude to war and peace is a reliable indicator of a system's stability or vulnerability. The *Christian Science Monitor* has said recently that the United States reaches for arms whenever it feels especially unsure of itself.

Indeed, is it a healthy society which fears peaceful competition with a different system and looks to profit from others' troubles? Is it a modern social system which prefers confrontation to co-operation and pins its hopes on its survivability in nuclear war and not on its ability to assert itself peacefully? Is it realistic policy to invent an alternative to peaceful coexistence, detente and disarmament and claim that it has been found—in the doctrine of "American leadership and superiority"?

Peaceful coexistence and detente are not merely products of a brilliant mind. True, it took political and ideological courage to understand and fully accept the fact that countries with opposite social system would exist side by side for a long historical period. It took keen vision to advance, at the time the Soviet republic was born, a disarmament programme to prevent new wars and condemn war as an un-

suitable and inadmissible method of settling international disputes. It took not only conviction but also wisdom to make peace the cornerstone of Soviet policy, the way the 26th CPSU Congress did.

All this is very important. Even if the US Congress boosts the nation's defense budget to 250 or, as some experts believe, 300 billion dollars, even if the United States adds scores and even hundreds of new bases to the 1,500 military sites it has outside its national territory, this will not remove the objective need to maintain peace as the foremost condition for the preservation of life on Earth and the exercise of human rights. On the contrary, the arms race increasingly reveals the glaring contradiction between the vital needs of nations and the state of international affairs, the incompatibility of aggression and military threats with the current level of science and the productive forces.

The scientific and technological revolution is yet to be matched by a revolution in military and political thinking. It will surely come, but the question is when and how much the insight will cost.

The causes which led the East and the West to conclude, in the late 1960s and the early 1970s, that they should restructure their relations on a neighbourly basis are still there. The current aggravation in international affairs has been contrived artificially. To a great degree it is an outward reflection of the contradictions within the imperialist system, the result of losses suffered by certain politicians or certain influential groups.

Some Western governments tend to blame others for their own failure to understand what is happening and to act logically. It is particularly common when conservative mentality bristles at the contact with something new and unusual. Conclusions, whether constructive or destructive, and all they entail are products of conscious action. Good or bad policies are conceived by people. Tensions do not arise by themselves; they are called forth because someone needs them.

New problems will appear constantly, as long as man lives. They will require a fresh, balanced, sober and responsible approach on the part of all interested parties. Earth's atmosphere is not the only thing that is the same everywhere; seas and oceans are not the only common heritage. Peace, too, is single and indivisible; both security and danger affect everyone.

The Soviet Union is firmly convinced that detente, co-operation and joint international effort to solve the current and incipient problems in the interests of all remain the only correct answer to the challenges mankind faces. *"Not war preparations that doom the peoples to a senseless squandering of their material and spiritual wealth, but consolidation of peace—that is the clue to the future,"*¹ Leonid Brezhnev stressed in the CPSU Central Committee's report to the 26th Congress.

The world expects the West and, above all, US leaders to decide on their approach to the cardinal issue of today, on the importance peace holds for them, on their readiness to work, together with others, for peace.

¹ *Documents and Resolutions*. . . , p. 40.

ANY ALTERNATIVE TO MILITARY EQUILIBRIUM?

Professor OLEG BYKOV, Dr. Sc. (Hist.)

Political analyst, b. 1926. Finished Moscow Institute of International Relations in 1949, Deputy Director of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations since 1977. Vice-President of the International Institute for Peace in Vienna, and member of the Pugwash Movement. Member of the Soviet Peace Committee and the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation. Deputy Chairman of the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament.

Oleg Bykov has written extensively on key aspects of contemporary international relations and disarmament.

No assessment of the present international situation is conceivable without taking account of the military balance that has taken shape between East and West. The strategic equilibrium between the USSR and the USA, between the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO, has laid the foundation for arms limitation, for successive lowering of the level of military confrontation and for gradual advance to actual disarmament. It has become a key factor buttressing international stability, furthering detente, and promoting peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

The general strategic military equilibrium was a legitimate result of the changed relation of forces in world affairs. The historic competition of the two world systems had come to a point where imperialism irretrievably lost its ability to overcome socialism by armed force.

The change in the balance of military strength, compounded with the steady invigoration of socialism's positions and with other progressive changes in the modern world, paved the way for a fundamentally

new strategic situation. Its main feature is that now no one can with impunity bring off a nuclear-missile assault. In whatever way a war is started, the aggressor will not escape a crushing retaliatory strike. Irrespective of the distinctions in the structure of the strategic forces and the geographical situation of the USSR and the USA, the dynamic equilibrium that shaped between them rules out any chance for either side to secure decisive superiority. This is also true of the confrontation between the Warsaw Treaty countries and the countries of the North Atlantic Alliance.

The military equilibrium of the socialist and the capitalist world benefited the international situation, and halted the drift to nuclear catastrophe. The futility of seeking superiority in the hope of winning a nuclear war stimulated joint search of ways of lowering the level of military confrontation, limiting and reducing armaments. The principle of undiminished security of either side grew into a realistic basis for accords and agreements curbing the arms race.

The strategic parity of the USSR and the USA was, indeed, the backbone of Soviet-American relations. The two parties recognised that in the prevailing situation there was no sensible alternative to the maintenance of peace and peaceful coexistence. The principles of equality and equal security, respect for each other's interests, and non-interference in each other's internal affairs paved the way to a set of important treaties and agreements, including those on the prevention of nuclear war, on certain measures with respect to the limitation of strategic offensive arms, and on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems. Soviet-American negotiations were begun on reducing military activity in the Indian Ocean, on the banning or limitation of various types of weapons, on restricting the arms trade, and on many other problems related to disarmament. In 1979, the leaders of the USSR and the USA signed SALT-2, the treaty on the limitation of offensive strategic arms.

The equilibrium of military strength in Europe laid a solid foundation for joint efforts of states that took part in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe to seek military detente in a region of the world that in many ways determines the global strategic situation and the international political climate. One important area of these efforts were the Vienna talks on reducing armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. In general, the strategic military parity exercised a visibly beneficial effect on international affairs throughout the se-

venties. Its positive bearing on the containment of the arms race was incontestable.

But as the world came to the eighties, an about-turn occurred in the policy of the United States and some other NATO countries. In the teeth of the realities of today's world—the consolidation of socialism's positions, the successes of the national liberation movement, and the mounting struggle for democracy and social progress—warlike imperialist forces decided to again try and halt the objective process of the renewal of the world. And their main blow they aimed at the prevailing strategic equilibrium, seeking to upset it in their own favour and to the detriment of the Soviet Union, of the socialist community, of international detente and security.

In the context of their tougher posture, US and NATO leaders launched war preparations on scale and at rate unheard-of in peacetime. Under US pressure, the North Atlantic bloc passed decisions to steeply increase military budgets, to upgrade long-term arms programmes, and to site new US medium-range missiles in Western Europe.

The build-up of the US arsenal of strategic and other arms is being accelerated. Full-scale production of the neutron bomb has begun. Development of laser, space and other types of weapons that were considered fantastic only recently, is being stepped up. New conventional arms systems are being deployed by US armed forces on a large scale. The US Navy is getting more and more ships. So-called rapid deployment forces are being activated for use in various parts of the globe. Plans are afoot to raise the numerical strength of the armed forces.

US military spending is growing to gigantic proportions. Allocations have gone up from 182,400 million dollars in fiscal 1981 to 218,800 million in fiscal 1982, and are to increase further—to 263,000 million dollars in fiscal 1983, to 291,000 million in fiscal 1984, and 338,000 million in fiscal 1985. All in all, it is planned to spend the mind-boggling sum of over 1,600,000 million dollars in five years (up to 1986).

There is this logical question: what is the purpose of these extraordinary measures? Why such colossal military spending in peacetime?

The official explanation does not square with either the objective state of affairs or elementary common sense. It is no more than a screen for the revival of the imperialist "positions of strength" policy, which is an especial menace to world peace because it is materialising in large-scale and long-term preparations for war.

The claim of US and other NATO politicians and generals that the

Soviet Union and its allies have of late militarily outstripped the United States and its West European partners, and that the West must therefore urgently rearm to restore the balance, does not really stand up to scrutiny. Only recently, all concerned recognised the veracity of Soviet-American parity and the rough balance of strength of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO countries. This was reflected in a number of agreements and accords, and can, in fact, be adequately and dependably verified. There could not have been, nor had there been, any sudden change in the global strategic situation since then. The balance of military strength between the USSR and the USA, between the WTO and NATO, is still stable. The facts and figures are common knowledge and are hardly open to doubt.

Quite a number of US and West European statesmen and experts do not take the propaganda ploy of "imbalance" as *a fait accompli* at all seriously. They prefer to say that the dynamics of the arms race is turning against the USA and NATO, and that the surfacing tendencies may, at some future date, cause them to fall behind the Soviet Union and the WTO. The conclusion they draw, however, is the same: the West's military potential has got to be rapidly upgraded.

To be sure, until only recently the US leadership had not thought the military competition with the Soviet Union was swinging against the United States. During the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing on the SALT-2 Treaty, in fact, top Pentagon experts made it quite clear that despite the wholly natural discrepancies of the strategic arms modernisation cycles of the two sides, the dynamic equilibrium between the USSR and the USA would prevail in the foreseeable future. Now, however, Washington is trying to create the impression that the tide has turned abruptly in the Soviet Union's favour. But that could not have happened, nor has it happened. Basic arms systems take ten to twelve years to develop, and it is impossible to reduce that term substantially and perform the scientific and technical "leap" that provides the thrust for any marked lead in the military field.

There is absolutely no denying this fact. And no one in Washington or in NATO headquarters has, indeed, tried to deny it. No serious attempt has been made to impartially assess the whole set of interacting tendencies that determine the future military balance of the USSR and the USA, and of WTO and NATO. Instead, separate elements are being singled out arbitrarily, and employed for tendentious projections of just those components of the strategic equation that could prove un-

favourable to the West, while ignoring all the elements that could be unfavourable to the other side. And the main emphasis is laid not on analysis of the material and factual side of the matter, that is, on the actual possibility of any one-sided military build-up, but on speculation about "intentions" slanderously ascribed to the Soviet Union. In other words, the main thrust of the arguments in favour of escalating the militarist preparations of the USA and NATO is lodged in the gratuitous assumption of a Soviet military threat.

The Soviet Union does not intend, nor ever has intended, to threaten or attack any country or group of countries. The Soviet military potential does not exceed the level needed for defence. The size and purpose of the military power of the USSR is in harmony with its military doctrine, which is in essence purely defensive and is not aimed at securing military superiority. It is in complete accord with the principles of the Leninist foreign policy of peace, and is oriented on defence of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states, on preventing imperialist aggression, and on ensuring international security. The Soviet military doctrine has nothing to do with preventive wars of conquest of any kind or scale, or with any concept of pre-emptive nuclear strikes.

There is no such thing as a Soviet military threat. But a tangible threat does hang over the world. And that threat comes not from the Soviet Union, from its imaginary superiority today or tomorrow, but from the arms race itself, compounded with rising international tensions.

If the people at the helm in the United States and other NATO countries were sincere in their concern for security and stability on the international scene, the only sensible option for them—one that has compellingly demonstrated its worth during the seventies—would be to work for a sound political climate in the world, to exercise restraint, and to curb the arms race.

The process of balancing forces that are being continuously modernised is becoming increasingly harder to control owing to the rapid development of military technology and the advantages that one or the other side has in specific types of weapons within the framework of the general parity. Past experience shows, however, that given the goodwill on both sides, these difficulties can be overcome through the elaboration of pertinent treaties and agreements, securing the prevailing equilibrium, moving on steadily to a lowering of its level, and li-

miting and reducing armaments on the principle of equality and equal security.

But accords on holding down the arms race is precisely what the US Administration has shown no serious inclination to achieve. Arms limitation and disarmament rank at the very bottom of its list of political priorities. The United States has broken off or indefinitely suspended bilateral and multilateral negotiations on many relevant matters. It has shelved the ratification of the SALT-2 Treaty and the entire strategic arms limitation process. What is more, the Pentagon chiefs are clearly bent on torpedoing some already concluded treaties and agreements. The value of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, for example, which is of unlimited duration, has already been placed in question. The USSR-US Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War, too, has become a target of attacks.

All this is not accidental, but the natural effect of the unprecedented superarming that Washington has set its sights on with the object of gaining an advantage in all classes of nuclear and conventional arms. Its aggressive intents are all too clear whatever slogans are used to conceal this—whether that of “restoring the balance” or that of “averting a future imbalance”. The whole thing hinges on the USA gaining superiority over the Soviet Union.

The past attitude of US ruling circles to rough military parity had been twofold. They were uncomfortable with such parity and were always eager to upset it for it inhibited their aggressive designs. This on the one hand, but on the other they were obliged to reckon with the balance of strength, which had tilted against them. In the seventies, the West was on the whole inclined to recognise the need for adapting to the new situation. This helped to eliminate many an obstacle to international co-operation and to curbing the arms race. Now, however, the aim of upsetting the prevailing equilibrium has taken precedence in the USA. Winning military superiority has been raised to the level of US state policy.

This is something that gravely destabilises the system of international relations that had shaped under the effects of the global strategic military equilibrium. US imperialist elements are seeking military superiority to use it as a lever of pressure on the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, on progressive, liberation and democratic movements, thereby to alter in their favour the alignment and balance of

world forces. The repercussions this break-up of the pillars of relations between states, above all between states of the two world systems, would entail is more than apparent. Courting the danger of world-wide nuclear holocaust, the ruling elite in the USA is making one more attempt at forcibly driving the process of history into a channel suiting its narrow, self-seeking interests.

What is there to say about this brusque swing in US policy? The bid for military superiority in so concentrated a form speaks of reckless adventurism. Despite the radical social and political change across the world and despite the revolution in science, technology, and the military field, the extreme aggressive forces of US imperialism are bent, as before, on attaining the unattainable and recovering their erstwhile supremacy in world affairs by brute military force.

To seek military superiority in the hope of winning the war is adventurous, dangerous, and fruitless. The military equilibrium between the socialist and the capitalist world is a fundamental, qualitative, and irreversible achievement. The capability of destroying each other has drawn a line through the old concept of victory.

The very idea of achieving military superiority is now obviously unrealistic. Given the concrete historical fact that the economic, scientific, technical and military potentials of the two sides are equivalent, it is impossible to count on restoring the situation to what it had been before, not even by monstrously inflated spending and deliberate concentration of effort. It is unrealistic to seek the ability of delivering so disarming a strike that it would deny the adversary any chance of inflicting a crippling counter-strike. This makes the war unwinnable for the aggressor. There is no chance of exploiting the vulnerability of the other side before one eliminates one's own vulnerability, and that will not be feasible in the foreseeable future.

Certainly, the equilibrium of fear, as it is called in the West, cannot by itself, automatically, rule out a head-on collision. In an atmosphere of international tension and an unbridled arms race, events are liable to come out of control and lead to a disastrous escalation of some conflict, causing nuclear war to break out. The prospect of such a catastrophic outcome is made more likely by the evolution of US strategic concepts that widen the option of using mass annihilation weapons. Pentagon's plans of waging "limited nuclear war" and "lowering the nuclear threshold", which repose on perfection and diversification of nuclear arms, are eroding the critical line between an or-

dinary and a nuclear conflict. Yet warfare involving the use of mass annihilation weapons differs in quality from any other sort of armed action. To wage nuclear war by any "rules" that may have been worked out beforehand by one side or the other is, in effect, totally impossible. In whatever dosage the weapon is used and however localised the conflict may be, its very outbreak is likely to lead to a swift and unrestricted spread of nuclear warfare.

Some generals and military theorists in the United States just will not stop thinking in terms of megatons and megadeaths. Today, in the setting of strategic parity, they are blandly continuing to estimate the acceptable destruction and loss of life in US territory as the price of victory in a nuclear war. But while these abstract estimates may work as a means of whipping up militarist hysteria, any nuclear scenario based on them would inevitably result in catastrophe for the United States and in incalculable suffering for the rest of mankind.

Be that as it may, the craving to come out on top in an exchange of nuclear strikes has for many years visibly affected politico-military thinking in the United States. And the bid for military superiority is only stimulating this foolhardy idea because it creates the illusion that a disarming first strike is possible.

US policy-makers are escalating war preparations and toughening the confrontation in the hope that pressure and threats will make the Soviet Union give up its gains and modify the nature and orientation of its foreign policy. It is their aim, too, to disrupt the Soviet economy by extending the scale and accelerating the rate of the arms race, to impair the Soviet social programmes, and to complicate economic ties within the socialist community.

These designs are built on sand. The Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries have all they need to maintain their security, and, indeed, are firmly resolved to defeat imperialism's plans of aggression. As Leonid Brezhnev said at the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, "we have not sought, and do not now seek, military superiority over the other side. That is not our policy. But neither will we permit the building up of any such superiority over us. Attempts of that kind and talking to us from a position of strength are absolutely futile."

When the security of the Soviet Union and its friends and allies is in jeopardy, and when international security in general is threatened,

the socialist community will be able to marshal its considerable potential to meet the challenge. In the prevailing circumstances, the military build-up of one side is bound to call forth requisite counter-measures by the other. But that is not the choice of the USSR and its allies. They are suggesting that steps upsetting the equilibrium should be prevented, that deployment of new weapons should be arrested, and that the level of the military confrontation should be lowered in all fields.

Soviet-American strategic parity is undeniable. It is backed by official figures recorded in the SALT-2 Treaty. And if the present administration in Washington is obstructing this agreed document signed by the two sides from entering into force, it does so for reasons other than the alleged change in the relation of strategic power. It claims that the Soviet Union may outstrip the USA in future. If so, however, the most logical thing would be to ratify the SALT-2 Treaty, which entrenches parity in strategic arms, restricts the number of nuclear delivery vehicles to 2,250, and sets barriers to their further numerical and qualitative growth. To prevent any destabilisation of parity in the future, the sides should long since have tackled the next stage of strategic arms limitation, SALT-3.

But the US leadership is in no hurry to resume the SALT process. As is clear from utterances of members of the present administration, it is less opposed to any of the concrete aspects of the accords reached, and, in fact, opposes the very principle of equality and equal security on which the accords are based. That is why it wants the SALT-2 Treaty revised in favour of the United States, and why it is mulling over reduction variants that would substantially slash the Soviet strategic forces, while leaving those of the USA virtually intact. The main thing, however, is the crash build-up of the US strategic nuclear potential.

The programme launched in 1979 for rearming 300 Minuteman III ICBMs with the highly accurate new Mk12A 350-kiloton warheads is in the stage of completion. Twelve Poseidon atomic submarines have been fitted with Trident I missiles. In September 1981, the first of the B-52G bombers adapted to strategic cruise missiles was put into service in the combat-ready force of the US Strategic Air Command. The bomber can lift 12 missiles, and will lift as many as 20 after additional modification. In just the early half of the eighties, it is planned to arm nearly half the heavy bombers with cruise missiles. With

this aim in view, mass production of cruise missiles has already been launched.

In November 1981, the US Navy commissioned the *Ohio*, its first Trident nuclear-powered missile submarine armed with Trident I missiles. One such submarine surpasses 10 Polaris nuclear-powered missile submarines in combat potential. Before 1990, the Pentagon is planning to have 13 such submarines, and intends to continue building them in the years to follow.

In October 1981, President Reagan announced his strategic programme for the eighties, containing provisions for a further build-up of the strategic nuclear potential. A nearly 50 per cent increase is planned of the share of the strategic forces in the US military budget. The White House estimates expenditure under the programme at 222,000 million dollars in just 1982-1987.

A special place in the strategic programme is accorded to a plan for deploying M-X intercontinental ballistic missiles. Designed as a first-strike weapon, the M-X will have ten warheads of 600 kilotons each. Considering its high degree of accuracy, it is intended for hardened targets, that is, for delivering a nuclear knockout. A hundred such missiles are to be stationed in hardened silos. Furthermore, before 1984 it is planned to complete research and decide on alternative basing modes for additional M-X missiles.

From 1989 on, a new, considerably more powerful and effective submarine-launched ballistic missile, Trident II (D-5), will replace Trident I. The new missile will have practically the same combat capability as the M-X ICBM, meaning that it will be a first-strike weapon.

The strategic programme provides for the development of a new bomber, the B-1B carrier of cruise missiles. It is planned to build and put into service 100 such aircraft, each capable of lifting up to 30 cruise missiles, before 1988. At the same time, it is planned to develop a fundamentally new strategic bomber called Stealth—an aircraft which will not be detectable by existing air defence facilities and therefore usable for surprise nuclear strikes.

On completing this programme, the Pentagon will have raised the total deliverable number of strategic nuclear weapons in one launch/sortie by at least 50 per cent in just the current decade.

Reagan's strategic programme also includes a set of measures improving the system of operational control and communications of the

strategic offensive forces in order to ensure reliable command in a nuclear war.¹

The ultimate aim of this crash build-up is more than apparent. The USA is out to gain a substantial strategic edge, so as then to comport itself vis-à-vis the Soviet Union from the position of a superior power.

The scheme is futile. As has been authoritatively stated by the Soviet side, no one should beguile himself with the illusion that the USSR will consent to any agreement giving the United States a one-sided advantage. Neither should anyone imagine that the Soviet Union will take no additional steps to buttress its defence capability if its vital interests are jeopardised. The USSR did not achieve parity in order to let anyone later destroy the basis on which it is possible both to ensure equal security and to lower the level of the strategic confrontation. That is the only realistic basis in existence and it can and must be reinforced. There has never been, nor is there now, any sensible alternative to mutual limitation and reduction of strategic arms.

The Soviet Union considers strategic arms limitation a task of extraordinary importance, and is ever ready, without delay, to continue the pertinent negotiations with the USA, preserving all the positive elements that have so far been achieved in this area. The USSR is prepared to negotiate limitation of weapons of all types and, among others, limitation of deployment by both sides of new submarines and prohibition of modernising existing and developing new ballistic missiles for these submarines.

The Soviet leadership has called on the US Administration to refrain from creating artificial obstacles to the strategic arms limitation talks, and to resume them without further delay. And it suggested a mutual commitment not to open any new channels of the arms race, and not to deploy either sea- or ground-launched long-range cruise missiles, before the talks are resumed.

There are also requisite objective opportunities for curbing the nuclear arms race in Europe. Rough parity in Soviet and NATO medium-range weapons has evolved there over a number of years. On the NATO side it consists of missiles and aircraft that can reach targets

¹ See *Whence the Threat to Peace*, Military Publishing House, Moscow, 1982, pp. 29-34.

in the Soviet Union from launching sites in West European countries and the seas adjoining Europe, that is, with an action radius of 1,000 and more kilometres (naturally excluding US intercontinental ballistic missiles), and on the Soviet side of analogous weapons of the same range stationed in the European part of the USSR. And, by and large, this equilibrium had been securely maintained, irrespective of the modernisation of these nuclear forces on both sides.

The NATO countries have 986 delivery vehicles to be used on the European continent, including more than 700 US aircraft (F-111, FB-111, F-4 and carrier based aircraft in waters washing European shores). In addition, there is the British nuclear potential of 64 ballistic missiles and 55 nuclear-capable bombers, and the French potential of 98 missiles and 46 bombers.

The Soviet Union disposes of 975 weapons of the same kind.¹

US forward-based systems, and nuclear-capable aircraft stationed at air bases in a number of West European countries and on board aircraft-carriers, as well as the ground-launched medium-range ballistic missiles, nuclear-armed submarines, and bombers of Great Britain and France, are being modernised and improved.

Analogous Soviet weaponry is also being modernised. But for several decades the total of Soviet medium-range delivery vehicles in Europe has not been raised by a single unit. The number of missile-launchers has, indeed, even gone down, because with the deployment of each new missile which the West has named SS-20, the Soviet Union simultaneously dismantled one, sometimes two, of the old missiles, and did not site them in other regions. The aggregate yield of the Soviet medium-range nuclear potential is also being reduced.

But the equilibrium in medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe is jeopardised by the NATO decision to deploy new US missiles on its territory. The painstakingly balanced equation is to be unilaterally upset by the introduction of 572 additional delivery vehicles—Pershing II medium-range ballistic missiles and ground-launched Tomahawk cruise missiles.

If the new US missiles are deployed in Europe, NATO will gain an almost 50 per cent advantage in the number of medium-range delivery vehicles. What is more, if at present NATO medium-range nuclear weapons have 50 per cent more nuclear warheads than the cor-

¹ *Whence the Threat to Peace*, p. 65.

responding weapons of the USSR, the deployment of new US missiles will considerably augment this advantage¹

Should the NATO decision be carried out, the nuclear balance in Europe will be upset not only in terms of quantity. Another new element, and a highly significant one, would be the steep rise in US capability to create a direct strategic threat to the Soviet Union. The new American medium-range missiles on European soil would, in effect, serve as a considerable addition to the "central" strategic forces of the United States targeted on Soviet territory. While officially describing its new missiles designed for deployment in Europe as additional elements of its NATO allies' nuclear umbrella, the US political and military leaders really intend to use them for hitting vitally important targets in the western regions of the USSR. As distinct from the tactical Pershing I with an action radius of 750 kilometres now deployed in Europe, the Pershing II will have a range of 2,500 kilometres and a high degree of accuracy. The 108 such missiles that are to be deployed in a number of West European countries would be capable of hitting targets throughout the European part of the Soviet Union, and this within five or six minutes of launching. Add to this the 464 ground-based strategic cruise missiles with a range of 2,000 kilometres and with a still higher degree of accuracy.

All this would substantially alter the strategic situation not only in Europe, but also at the global Soviet-American level. And the change would be entirely in favour of the United States, and to the detriment of Soviet security.

It should be clear that the Soviet Union cannot ignore the stationing on European soil of new US nuclear weapons targeted on the USSR and its allies. In that event, as the Soviet leadership has stressed time and again, the USSR would be compelled to protect its own vital interests and those of the socialist community as a whole, and take counter-measures placing the other side in an analogous situation, including the United States and its territory.

But the Soviet Union would prefer not to engage in such mutual stockpiling of explosive material. It is offering a different path—that of halting the race of nuclear armaments in Europe, of consolidating the prevailing rough parity, and of moving forward consistently to a lowering of the level of confrontation in that region, where the main

¹ *Whence the Threat to Peace*, p. 68.

armed forces of the two world systems stand face to face. This approach would be obviously furthered by the moratorium proposed by the USSR on siting in Europe any new medium-range nuclear delivery vehicles by both NATO and the Soviet Union for the duration of the negotiations. The freeze would halt any further build-up of armaments, ban the siting of new and replacement of already stationed nuclear weapons, stabilise the situation in Europe, and thereby create favourable conditions for the talks on limiting medium-range weaponry.

The Soviet Union is striving to curb the nuclear arms race in Europe, and has substantially extended its moratorium proposal on the deployment of new and modernisation of available medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe for the duration of the pertinent negotiations. It has declared itself ready, given the consent to such a moratorium of the other side, to unilaterally reduce a certain part of its medium-range nuclear weapons in the European part of the country, moving forward to the lower level that the sides will agree upon as a result of the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva.

Later, the Soviet Union announced its intention, provided there is no new deterioration of the international situation, to reduce a certain number of its medium-range missiles on its own initiative already in 1982.

To facilitate a fair agreement on mutual reduction of nuclear weapons in Europe, and to show a good example, the Soviet leadership decided to impose a moratorium unilaterally on deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons in the European part of the USSR. The Soviet Union has frozen the already stationed weapons there both quantitatively and qualitatively, and has suspended the replacement of old missiles, known as SS-4 and SS-5, with the more sophisticated SS-20.

The unilateral moratorium will be operative until agreement is reached on reducing medium-range weapons designed for Europe or until the US leaders, scorning the interests of international security, might for all that launch practical preparations for the deployment in Europe of Pershing II and cruise missiles.

At the talks in Geneva, the Soviet Union has advocated the radical reduction by the two sides of their medium-range nuclear weapons by hundreds of units. It has offered to reduce their number to 300 units each by the end of 1990, and to the intermediate level of 600 units each by the end of 1985.

What is more, the Soviet Union is prepared to accept total renunciation by the two sides of all types of medium-range nuclear weapons trained on targets in Europe, and ultimately to eliminate all nuclear weapons in Europe—both medium-range and tactical. That would indeed be a true “zero option” and would work to consolidate universal security.

The Soviet approach to the problem of neutron munitions has been, and still is, just as constructive. As the Soviet Union sees it, the most sensible thing for the two sides would be to renounce this especially barbarian mass annihilation weapon. It will be recalled that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have come forward with a concrete draft international convention on banning the production, stockpiling, deployment, and use of neutron munitions.

The US Administration has ordered full-scale production of neutron bombs on the flimsy pretext that NATO must have a “counterweight” to the advantage that the Warsaw Treaty countries have in tanks. Yet in the overall equilibrium of NATO and WTO strength the advantage of one side in some type of armaments is balanced by the advantage of the other side in some other type of armaments. The Warsaw Treaty countries do have more tanks than the North Atlantic bloc countries. But this advantage does not upset the equilibrium, because NATO has an advantage in other types of conventional armaments, in tactical nuclear weapons and, notably, in guided anti-tank missiles. In fact, the United States wants neutron munitions not for stabilising the rough parity of military strength in Europe, but to augment the advantage over the USSR in tactical nuclear weapons.

The production of the new lethal weapon will trigger a new twist of the arms race and add to the danger of a nuclear conflict breaking out. It is only natural that the Soviet Union cannot afford to look on impassively as the new weapon appears in the arsenal of the USA and NATO. The Soviet leadership has given to understand that, if need be, the USSR will have a requisite counterweight. The Soviet Union, and the socialist community as a whole, is firmly opposed to any breach of the prevailing equilibrium, and has not abandoned resolute efforts to reach accords on mutual renunciation of the new weapon of mass annihilation.

It is essential to maintain the equilibrium in all fields, not only nuclear but also conventional. This applies above all to Central Europe, where rough parity between the Warsaw Treaty countries and the

NATO countries has already taken shape, with the numerical strength of the armed forces in the region numbering 979,000 and 991,000 respectively.

The Vienna negotiations on reducing armed forces and armaments in Central Europe have been going on for nearly nine years. Positions have come closer visibly on the basis of the agreed principle of undiminished security of either side. In the interests of reaching agreement, the USSR and other socialist countries have gone far out of their way to meet the West on a number of important points. But owing to the unconstructive posture of the NATO countries, the Vienna talks are at an impasse.

Western negotiators are at pains to prove that the bone of contention now concerns discrepancies in the data on the ground forces of the socialist states. At the same time, the West is sidestepping joint search of a solution to this problem which it has itself created. It refuses to explain what its exaggerated estimates are based on, and is evading the issue of disputed personnel categories, which are calculated variously in the WTO and NATO armed forces. The West has rejected the several approaches suggested by the socialist countries to overcome the difficulties, but offers nothing of its own instead. The hitch, consequently, is not in the data. For the United States and its West European partners freezing the Vienna talks is but another element in the policy of aggravating the military confrontation and continuing their unilateral build-up of military power.

Achieving constructive progress at the Vienna talks, however, is vitally necessary for European and international security, and objective premises for it are at hand. What is needed is reciprocal political resolve to get matters off the ground and to begin moving towards a lower level of military confrontation in the heart of Europe.

To stabilise the strategic situation it is also essential to agree on measures limiting and reducing military presence and activity in various regions—the Atlantic, the Indian and Pacific oceans, the Mediterranean Sea, the Persian Gulf, the Middle and the Far East.

In short, the course of events shows that the United States and certain other NATO countries intend to go against the facts and to seek military superiority over the USSR and its Warsaw Treaty allies. But where will this reckless line lead?

As we have endeavoured to show, it is practically impossible to upset the strategic military equilibrium. Whatever the United States and

NATO may do, they will not succeed in tilting the balance of strength in their favour. In the end the equilibrium will prevail, but at a higher level and at the price of tremendous expenditure and less mutual security.

Furthermore, the attempts to win military superiority will affect the international situation. Long-term and large-scale war preparations stir up world tensions, and breed suspicion and hostility. The arms development programmes of one side compel the other to plan counter-measures, and this at a level matching the most unfavourable probable outcomes of the programmes in question. That, in turn, elicits the response of the side that had initiated the arms race escalation in the first place. As a result, the vicious circle of action-counter-action keeps spiralling. The accelerated build-up of military power makes the development of the already dissimilar structures and alignments of the two sides still less synchronous and still more unsymmetrical. As a result, the strategic and political situation in the world becomes destabilised and the danger of an uncontrolled escalation of international conflicts increases.

At present, the rise of international tension, though it imperils world security, seems to suit the American leadership. But there are no guarantees at all that the consequences of the negative process will not affect the United States as well. By breeding danger, the US inevitably incurs danger to itself. By fomenting instability, it exposes itself to its adverse effects. The unpredictability of the consequences of the unbridled arms race puts both sides in an equally difficult situation.

Any erosion of the military equilibrium is fraught with sudden change in the alignment of strength in some region and, for that matter, in the world as a whole, including such change as may go counter to the interests of the United States. If today, for example, Washington has laid its stakes on strategic partnership with Peking, it is not unlikely that in the event of some abrupt destabilisation in world affairs, China will want to take advantage of it and play the anti-American card.

The fruitless scramble for unattainable military superiority is, in the final analysis, bound to affect the internal situation in the countries concerned, and also their own relations as allies. The colossal and continuously increasing military spending is aggravating the inflation, ruling out elimination of the budget deficit, complicating any structural modification of the economy, augmenting business recessions, and

leading to cutbacks in social programmes in the United States and in certain West European countries. The anti-war forces are protesting against the dangerous and wasteful militarist course. Disaffection is mounting among the broad mass of the people. The unequal stake that the USA and its West European partners have in toughening the confrontation and their unequal degree of readiness to face the concomitant hardships and risks is causing ever more profound differences within the North Atlantic bloc.

Guided by the resolutions of the 24th, 25th and 26th congresses of the CPSU, the Soviet Union is working perseveringly to consolidate peace, curb the arms race, preserve and extend detente, and ensure international security and the freedom and independence of nations. And maintenance of rough military parity in the modern world, precluding unilateral advantages and offering the prospect of arms limitation and reduction agreements and agreements on disarmament, is an indissoluble part of this consistent and principled struggle of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union wants to have normal relations with the United States, for there is no other sensible alternative in keeping with the interests of the people of both countries and the interests of all humanity. The ball is now in Washington's court.

Should the leaders of the USA and NATO, in their bid to upset the strategic military balance, destroy the existing basis for agreement on military and political detente and for better relations with the USSR and the other socialist countries, and should they opt for the reckless gamble of attaining military superiority rather than for negotiating arms limitation, the grave responsibility for this to the peoples of their own countries and to all people in the world will fall squarely on their shoulders.

In the seriously complicated international situation, the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community are firmly set on a policy that combines unflinching rebuff to any aggressive designs with constructive peace initiatives. They are keeping the door open for positive change, and are ready for dialogue on the basis of equality and reciprocity.

POLITICS AND WAR

ALEXANDER BOVIN, Cand. Sc. (Phil.)

Journalist, political analyst, b. 1930. Finished the law school of Rostov University in 1953. On the editorial staff of the journal *Kommunist* from 1959 to 1963, and on the staff of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union from 1963 to 1972. Political observer of *Izvestia* since 1972. Member of the Central Auditing Commission of the CPSU, deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, and member of the Commission on Foreign Affairs of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR. Member of the Soviet Peace Committee and of the Board of the Soviet Peace Fund. Member of the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament.

Alexander Bovin has written extensively on general topics of world politics.

The genesis of wars dates to the remote history of mankind when social classes did not yet exist. But not until society split into antagonistic classes and the state was formed, not until the birth of politics as a specific type of occupation, did war gain social and political content, giving rise to permanently functioning institutions (armies and bodies of command) and turning into a classical, and for many natural, instrument of politics.

Scholars estimate that there have been some 15,000 wars in the past five millennia—including seven-year, thirty-year and hundred-year wars; holy wars, and “phoney” wars. People went to war to capture slaves and land, riches and power. Conquerors of today became the conquered of tomorrow. So the death-mill turned and turned, prompt-

ing many generations of thinkers to see "aggressive instincts" in man's very nature.

Not until the twentieth century did any fundamental changes come about. History is fond of paradoxes. On the one hand, our age is an apotheosis of wars and militarism. But, on the other, it has called into being forces and factors which inspire hope that the seemingly eternal death-mill will at last stop turning. The growth of socialism into a global factor and its greater role in world politics, like the strengthening of other progressive forces and movements, have visibly reduced the capability of imperialism. The social and political possibilities for starting aggressive wars, notably wars against socialism, against peoples that have liberated themselves from colonial slavery, have grown narrower too. But those, in a manner of speaking, are the external constraints that have nothing to do with the character of wars.

Intrinsic constraints, too, have come into being. They derive from the revolution in military technology. It has led to a real overturn in martial affairs. Weapons of unheard-of destructive power that defies the imagination have given rise to the following essential question: is nuclear war applicable as a means of reaching political ends?

According to von Clausewitz war is the *continuation of policy by other means*. War, Clausewitz wrote, is not simply a political act, but also a political instrument, a continuation of political relations, their exercise by other means. War is the means, the political problem is the end, and no means must ever be conceived without an end.¹ These ideas had once appeared to be as irrevocable as war itself. Only when war, its nuclear variety, began to seem unthinkable, did the postulates of Clausewitz first show a chink. This occurred in the fifties.

Let me cite a fairly typical viewpoint. "While it was once a national instrument of policy used to achieve national purpose or more power," writes British analyst Kingston-McCloughry, "total war may now well become an instrument of annihilation possibly to all belligerent nations and to civilization itself. . . . But take his [Clausewitz's] most fa-

¹ See General von Clausewitz, *Vom Kriege*, V. Vehr's Verlag, Berlin, 1918, pp. XXVIII, 19. Lenin observed: "This famous dictum was uttered by Clausewitz, one of the profoundest writers on the problems of war. Marxists have always rightly regarded this thesis as the theoretical basis of views on the significance of any war. It was from this viewpoint that Marx and Engels always regarded the various wars." (V. I. Lenin, "Socialism and War", *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 304).

mous pronouncement that 'war is the continuation of policy by other means'.... Nothing would seem further from the truth in the event of nuclear warfare."¹

This and similar pronouncements appeared at a time when the nuclear superiority of the United States was taken for granted. Generals were still intent on winning wars. But civilians were already raising admonishing voices: that which may look like victory *before* a war, will be tantamount to defeat *after* it. Their arguments were challenged. But not for long. All debates ceased, in effect, when the levelling up of the USA and Soviet potentials of destruction brought about what Henry Kissinger described as "a revolution in the strategic balance".² Nuclear parity is an indefinite enough concept to allow for various interpretations, especially if one delves into particulars. What is entirely definite, however, is that neither side has the potential for a disarming nuclear-missile strike. It follows that he who strikes first is sure to perish second. He is sure to perish—that, too, is definite, because neither side is able to defend itself effectively. The mutual renunciation by the USSR and USA of deploying anti-ballistic missile systems has brought this out most dramatically. "To start a nuclear war in the hope of winning it," as Leonid Brezhnev said, "could only be the act of someone who decided to commit suicide. Whatever power that attacker may have, and whatever means of starting nuclear war he may choose, he will not attain his aims. Retribution will inexorably follow."³

It is recognised that if country A inflicts a nuclear strike on country B, no matter how destructive, the latter will retain the ability to inflict on the former a counter-strike that will cause unacceptable damage. Given this approach (the concept of "assured mutual destruction"), nuclear weapons, while still theoretically a means of waging war, become essentially a means of preventing war.⁴ What we have is a strategic stalemate.

¹ E. J. Kingston-McCloughry, *Global Strategy*, Frederick A. Praeger, New York, 1957, pp. 19, 248.

² See *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 2, No. 4, Autumn 1979, p. 6.

³ *Pravda*, October 21, 1981.

⁴ I have deliberately used a formula to show the *logic* of nuclear thinking more clearly. It stands to reason that a politically conclusive analysis transcends the bounds of this scheme. The nuclear arms race was started by the United States. The Soviet response was in the nature of forced counter-actions, of reac-

Now is just the time to go back to Clausewitz. We agree with his nuclear-age critics: it is quite true that, as Bertrand Russell put it, "war cannot still be used as an instrument of policy".¹ But a slight correction is called for. Clausewitz's formula has a double meaning. On the one hand, it is a statement of fact. Politics, he writes, is the womb in which war is conceived.² If war is started, it is an instrument of politics, a continuation of politics, no matter what war it is and what means of destruction are used, whether conventional or nuclear. In that sense, Clausewitz is entirely up-to-date: war is in all cases a means of continuing politics. That is an axiom.

But Clausewitz's formula has one more meaning, not axiomatic at all. It leaves the statesman a choice—to achieve his political aim by peaceful means or to resort to armed force. In Clausewitz's time both options were in principle legitimate and rational, the final choice depending entirely on which was more appropriate. The policy of Bismarck, who unified Germany by "blood and iron", many perhaps be assessed variously, though certainly, we cannot deny that his choice had been rational.

But that was long ago. What about now? Can anyone now conceive a general nuclear war as "another" but still sensible means of state policy, that is, as a rational instance of political behaviour? No, here Clausewitz is out of date. It is impossible to find arguments, to single out a goal, that would justify nuclear war and yet remain within the bounds of reason. No political goal can justify jeopardising the survival of civilisation. "Hence the incontrovertible conclusion," as Konstantin Chernenko, member of the CC CPSU Political Bureau, said on the 111th anniversary of Lenin's birth, "that it is criminal to consider thermonuclear war a rational and 'legitimate' continuation of politics." That is the clear and unambiguous position of the Soviet Communist Party and the Soviet Union.

In sum, nuclear parity has enabled the world to "overcome" Clausewitz. Shifting from the realm of strategy to that of psychology, some describe the resulting situation as an "equilibrium of fear". It is anything but cosy to live in the shadow of a global cataclysm. But, to

tions to the aggressive and menacing moves of the USA. But the use of a political formula alters nothing in the end meaning of the nuclear equation.

¹ Bertrand Russell, *Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare*, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London, 1959, p. 90.

² Clausewitz, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

begin with, we have no other choice. Second, so far the strategic equilibrium has worked for peace, not war. Nevertheless, a peace reposing on an "equilibrium of fear" cannot be stable and constant. Strategic parity tends to reproduce itself at a higher and higher level. Armaments always play a dual role: they are the basis of security for one side, and a source of danger for the other. We may safely assume that on passing some limit, any increase in the quantity of armaments is less likely to buttress one's own security than to be seen as an additional danger to others. It appears that if we have not overstepped that limit yet, we have come very close to it.

In abstract terms, there may be two solutions to the nuclear stalemate. The first is resolute action against the threat of a head-on collision of the two systems; a gradual lowering of the level of strategic parity; security as the effect not of any build-up but of a limitation of armaments. The second is "rationalisation" of nuclear war through perfection of technical means and techniques, and orientation on its being winnable. The first leads to international detente, the second to intensified confrontation.

The first, I might add, is the basic guideline of Soviet foreign policy. The striving for peace that characterises the Soviet Union has no basis in any transient change of the situation, any change in the nature and means of warfare. It is rooted in the nature of socialism, and runs through the entire history of Soviet foreign policy. While we were alone, our voice was a voice in the wilderness. And that did not change, as I have said, until after World War II and the emergence of the socialist world system. "War is not fatalistically inevitable," the 20th Congress of the CPSU pronounced. Its resolution read: "In modern international conditions there are real possibilities of preventing the aggressive forces of imperialism from hurling the peoples into a new war, which, in view of the level of military technique, would bring the peoples incalculable losses and devastation."¹ Again and again, the Soviet Union called on the West to substitute negotiations for confrontation, to overcome the cold war inertia, and to pool efforts and try to lessen the threat of a hot war. The menace of wholesale annihilation had altered nothing in the fundamental principles of Soviet policy. It only spurred us to still more vigorous action.

¹ *Resolutions of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1956, p. 11.

In the West the situation was different. For the USA the switch to detente meant a radical re-assessment of the very philosophy of its foreign policy, which had organically included the obvjective of "rolling back" socialism. Not until the cold war had yielded nothing and the danger of total destruction had become a stark reality for the United States itself, did the White House begin remodelling its strategy. Credit for this is due to Richard Nixon and his administration. They managed to rise above the bigoted dime-a-dozen anti-communist cliches. They realised that it was necessary to come to terms before it was too late. That was how detente began.

The results were swifter and weightier than one could have expected at the junction of the sixties and seventies. In 1972, Moscow was receiving Nixon. The first accords on strategic armaments were signed. In Europe, too, there blew winds of change. The quadripartite agreement on Berlin and the set of treaties that the FRG concluded with its eastern neighbours put the German question on the only possible sensible plane. This paved the way to Helsinki.

Looking at the assessments and assumptions of those years one senses the element of euphoric fervour that had prevailed at the time. Not at all surprising. To be sceptical is the easiest thing on earth. Tens of millions of people had yearned for peace. They rejoiced at detente. They lived on hope. But not all their hopes by far were justified. Still, the Helsinki Conference has gone down in history as tangible and positive proof that East and West can find common ground and can come to terms.

The seventies were a time of intensive negotiations that covered practically all areas of relations between the two systems. The volume of trade increased visibly. Scientific, technical and cultural intercourse became more intensive. Positive change was observed in the field of military detente. And that was the main thing. Slowly, a compromise solution was shaping in Vienna. Though faltering now and then, the SALT-2 negotiations continued. A pertinent treaty was signed in Vienna in June 1979. One could well have thought that the cold war was over, that the threat of nuclear war was steadily receding, and that detente would finally become irreversible. Unfortunately, the Vienna meeting of Leonid Brezhnev and Jimmy Carter had, in effect, been the culmination point of the seventies as a decade of detente. To be sure, disturbing signs that militarist sentiment was mounting in the USA, that the Americans were departing from the course of co-operation

with the Soviet Union, had already begun surfacing in the early half of Carter's presidency. At first, this could still seem incidental, for the foreign policy of the Carter Administration was inconsistent, conflicting, and impulsive. But gradually the parts fell into a pattern. The United States was clearly turning from detente to confrontation. And, in effect, Reagan's installation in the White House completed the re-orientation of US foreign policy. The sights were set not on adapting America to the rest of the world but, on the contrary, on adapting the world to the needs and interests of the present-day United States. And if need be, to do so by means of the "big stick".

To meet the contingencies of this course, US foreign policy is being actively militarised. It has long since been proved that in the present state of things armed force does not automatically signify political influence.¹ But Washington today holds a different view. Armed force, its build-up and, finally, achievement of military superiority, so think Reagan's strategists, will give America back its political capital, will increase and extend its political influence. At the dawn of the atomic era, on March 29, 1946, the US Joint Chiefs of Staff addressed a document to the Secretary of State saying that "in the final analysis the greatest single military factor in the security of the world is the absolute military security of the United States".² Evidently, US military thinking is now back where it started from. But logic says that "absolute military security" of the USA stands for absolute insecurity and vulnerability of all other states, which, needless to say, is absurd and intolerable.

In 1976, addressing the 31st UN General Assembly, Henry Kissinger said that the inescapable lesson of the nuclear age was that the politics of tests of strength had become incompatible with the survival of humanity. He amplified: "Traditional power politics becomes irrational

¹ "Might may not be right, but most of us have agreed with Voltaire that God is on the side with the heaviest battalions. If it were true that the strongest military power always gets its way, then the United States, possessor of the greatest stock of nuclear military weapons in the world [let me remind you that this was written in the early sixties—A.B.], should be able to exercise its will among other nations with substantial success. But this has not been the case; military power is becoming increasingly ineffective as an instrument of international policy" (Seymour Melman, *Our Depleted Society*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, N.Y., 1965, p. 157).

² *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1946*, Vol. 1, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1972, p. 1166.

when war can destroy civilised life and when neither side can gain a decisive strategic advantage.” Coming from Kissinger this cannot be qualified as “red propaganda”. Yet a mere five years later Washington wantonly forgot this banal verity of the nuclear age. It is at pains to rationalise the irrational. US military theorists are trying to concoct a thinkable doctrine involving the use of unthinkable means. That applies first of all to the concept of “limited” nuclear war.

The latest round of lively discussion concerning “limited” nuclear war was set off by Presidential Directive 59 which Carter signed on July 25, 1980. According to that directive, prime significance should attach to striking pinpoint targets such as military installations, command posts, and communication centres. Directive 59 was preceded by Directive 53 (improvement of military communications) and Directive 58 (on effective procedure to safeguard civilian and military control in the event of nuclear war). In the opinion of their authors, these directives demonstrate US readiness for a protracted exchange of pinpoint “surgical” counterforce and countercontrol strikes, on the one hand, and, on the other, give the USSR to understand that it will not be able to knock out the upper echelons of the US machinery of state and disrupt control of military operations.

At the end of the seventies, US military planners revived some of the ideas fostered by Robert McNamara (US Secretary of Defense in 1961-1968) and, notably, James Schlesinger (US Secretary of Defense in 1973-1975), and laid the emphasis on flexibility and variety in their new nuclear strategy. Describing one of the elements of strategic flexibility, former US Defense Secretary Harold Brown said in 1978 that the USA must be capable of launching controlled counterattacks against a wide range of targets—including the adversary’s nuclear and conventional forces, lines of communication, war-supporting industry and targets of increasing hardness—from aircraft runways and nuclear storage sites to command bunkers and ICBM silos.¹ And here is Brown in 1979: “Assured destruction is necessary for nuclear deterrence, but it is not . . . sufficient as a strategic doctrine or as a sole basis for determining the characteristics of our strategic forces. While I have serious doubts about whether a nuclear war, once started, could be kept

¹ Department of Defense. Annual Report Fiscal Year 1979. Harold Brown. Secretary of Defense. February 2, 1978, U.S. Government Printing Office. Washington, 1978, p. 55.

limited. . . Effective deterrence requires forces of sufficient size and flexibility to attach selectively a range of military or other targets, yet enable us to hold back a significant and enduring reserve.”¹

What this means is that in the view of the Americans “assured destruction” cannot be considered a dependable enough deterrent despite the prevailing parity. Letting their imaginations run wild, the men in Washington fancy that the Soviet Union might want to capture the Persian Gulf area or hit Western Europe. They figure that Soviet strategists might think that the USA would not want to resort to its only available response—a massive strike at the USSR—for the sake of those faraway regions since the Americans know that a counter-strike of the same kind will, in effect, destroy the USA. That would give the Soviets a free hand. But if Moscow were to know that the Americans have the alternative of selective, pinpoint strikes, it would think twice before retaliating all-out and exposing itself to a US counter-strike of equal force, and would be likely to react to pinpoint strikes in similar fashion and thereby “limit” the hostilities.

All these conjectures repose on entirely false assumptions. The Soviet Union is farthest from the thought of seizing either the Persian Gulf or Western Europe. And not because it is being “deterred” by any alternative strategic response, but because starting a war is contrary to our policy principles and to the interests of our state. But should the Soviet Union be subjected to a nuclear attack of any kind, Moscow will hardly be inclined to engage in a duel: the country’s security will call for the most conclusive and resolute course of action.

The Americans motivate their latest “updating” of nuclear strategy with references to humanism. Why destroy centres of civilisation and wipe out hundreds of millions of people? If matters were reduced to a limited exchange of selective nuclear strikes nothing of the sort would happen. Had not the Russians lost 20 million lives in World War II and survived?

¹ *The SALT-II Treaty*. Hearings before the Committee On Foreign Relations. United States Senate. Ninety-Sixth Congress. First Session on Ex. Y, 9-1. The Treaty Between The United States of America and The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on The Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and The Protocol Thereto, Together Referred to As the SALT-II Treaty, Both Signed at Vienna, Austria, on June 18, 1979, and Related Documents, July 9, 10, 11, 12, 1979. Part I. U.S. Government Printing Office. Washington, 1979, p. 333.

A truly confounding "humanism" that. Or, rather, no trace of humanism at all. Real humanism requires that there should be no nuclear war. Yet Washington intends to tear down the restraints created by strategic stalemate, and to make a nuclear conflict thinkable. An abrupt lowering of the nuclear threshold—that is what this US "humanism" amounts to.

The other danger is psychological. Washington is out to persuade people that nuclear war is something entirely acceptable so long as it is waged skilfully, rationally, and by dosage. The falsehood here is lodged in the very substance of the matter. Nuclear war cannot be dosaged save in the seclusion of "strategic" study-rooms. "It is clear to everybody, after all," writes Dmitry Ustinov, USSR Minister of Defence, "that any action by the aggressor will inexorably and instantly elicit an overwhelming counter-strike by the side that was subjected to aggression. None but utterly irresponsible people can say that nuclear war may be waged according to some rules elaborated beforehand and by which nuclear missiles will explode in 'gentlemanly' fashion: exclusively over specific targets and doing no harm to the population."¹ To be sure, the Americans themselves, including the authors of Presidential Directive 59, are highly sceptical about the chances of limiting hostilities. We have already seen what Harold Brown said on the subject. Jimmy Carter was of substantially the same opinion. If nuclear war were fated to break out, he said, there would be a very great likelihood of its growing into a far larger nuclear conflict. In other words, to follow this scheme, "limited" nuclear war would merely be a nuclear detonator, the initial opening stage of a conflict that would be practically certain to escalate. This "humane" invitation to a dosaged exchange of nuclear strikes, therefore, is nothing but bait. And whoever falls for it will, in the long run, reap a full-scale nuclear catastrophe.

Officially, Washington says that its "new nuclear strategy" is of a defensive nature and does not, in principle, envisage a first strike. But I beg leave to question that. US military doctrines, despite all modifications, have always reposed on the possibility of a first strike. To support the above, let me cite a fairly long and illuminating passage from an interview with Daniel Ellsberg, a former Pentagon official:

"*Question:* America now controls more than 30,000 nuclear warheads: about 22,000 tactical (shortrange) weapons with the same aver-

¹ *Pravda*, July 25, 1981.

age yield as the Hiroshima-Nagasaki bombs, and more than 10,000 strategic (intercontinental) weapons with yields of up to 500 times that size. Do we need all those to deter a Soviet attack on the United States?

"Ellsberg: No. That's not what most of our weapons are for, and—contrary to what most Americans suppose—it never has been. Consider these facts: a single Poseidon submarine at sea, with 224 warheads, could destroy every Soviet city with a population of 100,000 or over. We have about 30 Poseidon and Polaris submarines at sea on alert at all times. . .

"Four or five of these submarines, enough to keep two at sea at all times, carry just 10 percent of our actual inventory of strategic warheads. The other 90 percent, including all our land-based missiles and our bombers—and the thousands of strategic warheads that Carter and now Reagan propose to add on: MX, Trident, and cruise missiles—probably don't add anything at all to the deterrence of a nuclear attack on this country. But, I repeat, in the eyes of war planners and the proponents of these weapons, that's not what they're for.

"Q: What are most of these weapons for, then?

"Ellsberg: To threaten or carry out counterforce attacks, that is, attacks on Soviet military capabilities—air bases, missile launching sites, sub pens, command posts, air defenses, and so forth—primarily in the context of a U.S. first strike. By that I don't mean U.S. 'preventive war', an aggressive attack out of the blue, but a U.S.-initiated attack on the Soviet homeland, either escalating an ongoing local conflict or in anticipation of a possible escalation by the Soviets. In either case, the major object would be to destroy Soviet nuclear missiles and planes before they had been launched.

"Q: Haven't various presidents committed us to not carrying out a first strike?

"Ellsberg: No. Never. Our military strategy has been based, ever since the debut of atomic weapons in 1945, on our possible first use of nuclear weapons to back up and complement any nonnuclear defense or intervention that we might make.

"Our NATO plans have always been explicitly premised on a U.S. first strike in response to a Soviet nonnuclear attack that NATO couldn't contain with conventional or tactical nuclear warfare."¹

¹ *Inquiry*, April 13, 1981.

That seems to be the general picture. As for the “new nuclear strategy”—the very logistics of “limited” warfare (the accent on greater accuracy and on invincibility of nuclear missiles), the choice of targets (silos, bases, airfields, and so on), and efforts to site nuclear weapons as close as possible to Soviet territory (“Euroweapons”)—all this makes it fairly safe to assume that Washington is planning a nuclear-missile attack. Hence the inevitable precautionary measures that Moscow is compelled to take. And many in the United States understand this. Here, for example, is what *The New York Times* says on the subject: “Is the United States now seeking a ‘first strike’ capability?... That seems to be the Soviet interpretation... Such a strategy could lead the Soviets to place their missile forces on hair-trigger alert, increasing the possibility of a catastrophic misunderstanding.”¹

I can well see the US military planners beating their chests and swearing that a first strike is farthest from their thoughts.² Possibly so. But intentions are liable to change. One is therefore compelled to consider not only intentions, but above all the real capability of the potential adversary. The gravest threat of nuclear war, said Charles Yost, former US Ambassador to the UN, comes not from any planned-in-advance aggression, but from the erroneous impression of one or of both sides that the other is considering or preparing a first strike. And the new doctrine is, indeed, highly conducive to creating that erroneous impression.

That is why any variant of the “limited” war doctrine is bound to destabilise the strategic situation, to redouble suspicion, and consequently to augment the danger of a nuclear collision. And a collision that, alas, will not be “limited”.

The fact that the mood in Washington is in favour of a further “rationalisation” of nuclear war, of endowing it with the classical status of political instrument, is borne out by attempts to reinstate the concept of victory. The viewpoint that had prevailed for nearly fifteen years was lucidly defined by Harold Brown: “I don’t think a nuclear war can be won... We believe that a nuclear attack will lead to the destruction of the USA and the USSR.” And the new posture is best

¹ *The New York Times*, August 13, 1980.

² Jimmy Carter described Directive 59 as a carefully considered, logical and evolutionary development in the defence capability of the United States.

presented in an article entitled, "Victory Is Possible", by Colin S. Gray and Keith Payne.¹

In the opinion of the two authors it is high time to end the stagnancy of nuclear war theory bogged down by deterrence strategy, and to go over to a "theory of military victory". As they see it, Presidential Directive 59 has taken a step in that direction, being oriented on the achievement of US "strategic superiority" through the development of highly accurate "counter-force" and "counter-control" weapons. Then and only then, they say, given the capability "to survive and win", nuclear power can be a "rational means of foreign policy". Only if there is faith in victory can effective pressure and threats, they conclude, be applied to the USSR in situations of crisis. /

In other words, if formerly "deterrence" was based on the menace of "assured destruction", it is now proposed to "deter" by the threat of victory. These are two basically different approaches. In the former case, mutual destruction is assured, i.e. deterrence is mutual. In the latter case, however, the symmetry of deterrence is wrenched out of shape, because while both sides can perish, they cannot both win. There is never more than one winner. And here it is envisaged that this one winner should be the United States. In effect, this means a US policy of torpedoing nuclear-missile parity and winning a strategic advantage. Objectively, that goal is unattainable. Subjectively, however, the Americans may one day think they have attained it and are able to "win", and then do the irreparable. Which brings us back to the conclusion that the "new nuclear strategy" can do nothing but destabilise the strategic situation.

To end the subject, let me cite this nuclear-missile curiosity, the speculation of Roger Fischer, Professor of Law at Harvard University. He holds that today, in face of the increased threat of war, it would be a good thing to try and plan "what should happen once hostilities started". Fischer suggests that NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation should jointly draft some mutually acceptable cease-fire provisions before a war begins: "an urgent hot-line message might then propose that both sides accept 'the 1980 Warsaw Pact/NATO standard cease-fire terms, Draft B, effective 0100 hours tomorrow'. The worse our relationship with the Soviet Union, the more urgent the task of preparing such a draft". Fischer's article ends on a quizzical note: "It is

¹ See *Foreign Policy*, No. 39, Summer 1980.

difficult for us, and particularly so for military officers, to recognize that the primary purpose of the next war would be to stop the war, and that doing so on acceptable terms would constitute victory. It is even more difficult to contemplate jointly drafting the terms of an armistice before a war begins." Whereto he adds: "As one upset NATO officer asked me: 'But if we have decided in advance how the war ought to stop, why have the war?'"¹ A naive question, but a legitimate one. Starting a war to stop the war—that is the logic of computer-obsessed strategic thinkers, a logic reduced to absurdity. To this absurdity leads the "rehabilitation" of Clausewitz. And precisely for that reason it is truly urgent and truly essential not to "rationalise the irrational", but to reach agreements that lessen the threat of nuclear holocaust.

The concentration of public attention on the problems of nuclear missiles is easily explained: they concern the survival of civilisation. And to all intents and purposes, we did manage to avert a nuclear war so far. The so-called local wars were different. We often say that peace is indivisible. That is true as an ideal, as a definition of what ought to be. In other contexts, in the context of what is, peace is unfortunately divisible. GDR historians have estimated 142 wars and armed conflicts in the world from 1945 to 1975, involving 81 countries.² Today these figures are far greater. According to some estimates more than 10 million people perished in these wars.³ And, mind you, the wars are becoming more and more ruthless and devastating. The ratio of army and civilian loss of life was 95:5 in World War I, 16:84 in the Korean war, and 10:90 in the war in Vietnam.⁴ So the problem of preventing, or at least minimising, local wars is of the utmost relevance.

The difficulty here is that Clausewitz's formula remains valid in both its senses. The choice between war and peace applies in its classical form, because the classical relation between military force and the political aim still prevails. And though present-day international law does not recognise the right to war,⁵ the latter is exercised *de facto*

¹ *The New York Times*, May 7, 1980.

² *International Affairs*, No. 3, 1980 (Moscow).

³ *Sovetskaya voyennaya entsiklopediya* (The Soviet Military Encyclopaedia) estimates the casualties at 20 million (see Vol. 1, p. 109).

⁴ *International Affairs*, No. 3, 1980.

⁵ According to G. I. Tunkin in *Teoriya mezhdunarodnogo prava* (Theory of International Law), Moscow, 1970, p. 280, "the state of war has in international law ceased to be a 'normal' state of relations between states; it is considered a result of a most serious breach of international law".

in spite of the fact that the pressure of public opinion, of the new sense of justice, has created a psychological climate in which the choice in favour of war is more difficult to make.

It is probably interesting to assess, even if roughly, the likelihood of armed clashes of various types. The least probable, as I see it, is war between the large developed capitalist states. The lessons of World War II, compounded with the class solidarity of the bourgeoisie in face of the rising socialism and the general fear of the wave of social change, have proved stronger than the prevailing inter-imperialist contradictions.

The most widespread in the fifties, sixties and seventies were wars and armed conflicts set off by the wish of the imperialist states to maintain their domination (or influence) over the vast expanses of the developing world. Nowadays, with imperialism's positions growing weaker, the independence of newly-free countries becoming stronger and with the democratic principles and standards of international law gaining more tangible content, it is more and more difficult to start and conduct wars and conflicts of that sort. Which does not at all go to say that a recurrence here and there is now ruled out. Southern Africa and Central America are the most vulnerable in that respect.

Marxist scholars have not studied the question of armed conflicts between states belonging to the world socialist system. It is clear in theory that such wars are contrary to the nature of socialism. But as we have already had occasion to see, the "nature of socialism" in real historical practice does not, so to speak, exist by itself, in abstract theoretical purity. Socialism's development may be accompanied with deformations, some of them fairly considerable. The common reason for them is the social, economic, and political backwardness of many of the countries that take the socialist road, coupled with the lasting influence of petty-bourgeois views and notions. Fertile soil appears for nationalism and chauvinism, and that can easily affect the foreign policy of the country concerned. And a foreign policy shot through with chauvinism may be (and does become) a source of armed clashes between countries belonging to the world socialist system.

In this final quarter of the twentieth century, the most widespread type of armed conflict are wars between developing countries. The reasons are obvious. The military clashes in the zone of liberated countries are generated, and will long be generated, by religious and territorial disputes, by tribal strife, by scimmages for sources of raw material,

and by analogous factors compounded with the general social and economic backwardness and with neo-colonialist policy. The situation is aggravated still more by the ongoing militarisation of Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

These conflicts are usually called local or peripheral. And that is what they are in formal terms. But in rare cases only (as in the case of the Irano-Iraqi war) are the belligerents not directly or indirectly connected with forces that are not local. Considering the increasing mutual dependence of events and states, nearly every local conflict in some way affects interests and forces of a global nature. Hence the likelihood of their growth beyond local boundaries.

Deepening of detente and wider spread of the principles of peaceful coexistence could lessen the danger of armed clashes between developing countries. Still, nothing but a general social and economic advancement of these countries will conclusively eliminate that danger.

* * *

In 1918, recalls Nadezhda Krupskaya, Lenin said of the nature and future of wars: "Modern technical means are now increasingly helping the destructive nature of war. But a time will come when war will become so destructive that it will be entirely impossible."¹ We have already come to that time, at least objectively. But subjectively the situation is not that simple. Different people, different classes and social groups, have a far from identical understanding of the changes going on in the world. Hence the attempts to outwit history, to operate in a new situation in accordance with old or only slightly touched up stereotypes. A typical example are the theories and actions in the field of nuclear strategy, designed to make nuclear missiles an active instrument of foreign policy. What Washington is after, indeed, is to make an impossible war possible, to make unthinkable loss of life and devastation thinkable.

Long long ago, somewhere in the mid-fourteenth century, Simon Islip Archbishop of Canterbury, made a special appeal to Edward III calling on the king to stop spending money on the upkeep of his cavalry, asking him to think how much it cost every year to keep one

¹ N. K. Krupskaya, *O Lenine* (About Lenin), Moscow, 1960, pp. 40-41.

charger. Thus, he said, each charger needed at least one yeoman to look after it, who got at least one and a half denarii a day for his sustenance. In addition two denarii were spent daily on oats and one on hay for the horse, which all came to four and a half denarii a day. Accordingly, the cost rose to two solidi and seven and a half denarii a week, a sum that would keep four or five of the king's poor subjects. How great then, the prelate asked, was the cost of all the king's chargers and yeomen? He gave the king "wise and sound counsel": to reduce the number of chargers so as to be able to pay his own and his father's countless debts.¹ These days the yardstick is of a different order. The "chargers" and the "yeomen" cost thousands of millions. But the "kings" are as deaf as they ever were to wise and sound counsel. The arms race continues. Attempts continue to retrieve the good old times when war was just as lawful a tool for the statesman as the plough was for the tiller and the sledgehammer for the blacksmith. But the past is irretrievable. More precisely, its retrieval will be prevented by the forces that are working to curb militarism, to end the arms race, to safeguard peace.

¹ Cited from M. M. Kovalevsky, *Ot pryamogo narodopravstva k predstavitelnomu i ot patriarkhalnoy monarkhii k parlamentarizmu* (From Direct Rule by the People to Representative Rule and from Patriarchal Monarchy to Parliamentary Rule), Vol. 1, Moscow, 1906, p. 238.

DISARMAMENT AND THE FOES OF DIALOGUE

Professor VICTOR ISRAELYAN, Dr. Sc. (Hist.)

Diplomat, b. 1919. Finished the First Moscow Medical Institute in 1941, and the Higher Diplomatic School in 1946. Veteran of the Great Patriotic War of 1941-45. Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, representative of the USSR on the UN Disarmament Committee, member of the collegium of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, member of the Soviet Peace Committee.

Victor Israelyan has written monographs on general history, the history of international relations, and Soviet foreign policy.

One of the important results and elements of the detente process of the seventies was the large number of international conferences, public gatherings, and bilateral as well as multilateral negotiations on problems of disarmament. These problems were also dealt with at the many summit meetings that largely determined the political climate of the past decade.

The negotiations resulted in various agreements pertaining to arms limitation and disarmament. True, the agreements could not halt the arms race as a whole, but they did erect barriers in some fields and held down its rate for a certain time. They showed that the governments of capitalist countries could no longer brush off the disarmament problem as easily as before. The changed political face of the modern world compelled them, in a number of cases, to reach accords.

The Soviet line and that of the socialist community as a whole of working out concrete measures designed to limit material preparations

for war enjoyed, and is still enjoying, increasingly broad support. This materialised, among other things, in the holding of the 1st Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament in 1978. The Final Act of that session spoke conclusively of the need to give effect to the various proposals and suggestions in the field of disarmament, and "to proceed along the road of binding and effective international agreements" on that score. The document repeatedly stressed the importance of serious negotiations leading to that sort of agreements. The Final Act solemnly declared that "all the peoples of the world have a vital interest in the success of disarmament negotiations".

The animation of the dialogue between states on questions of disarmament, and the widening of the range of problems discussed, was met with deep gratification by the world public. Limitation of the arms race and questions of disarmament gained greater prominence at UN General Assembly sessions, at follow-up conferences examining the operation of various international disarmament agreements, at sessions of the Disarmament Committee, at conferences of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and other forums.

The strategic arms limitation talks that began between the USSR and the USA at the end of 1969 exercised an especially beneficial effect on the international climate. In the latter half of the seventies, Soviet-American dialogue got off the ground in many other important areas of disarmament—prohibition of chemical weapons; limitation and subsequent reduction of military activity in the Indian Ocean; prohibition of the development of new types of mass destruction weapons, notably radiological; anti-satellite systems, and limitation of sales and delivery of conventional armaments. Negotiations on a complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests were launched by the USSR, the USA and Britain in 1977.

An initially useful dialogue, too, began in the seventies at the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe.

Certainly, the purposes and aims of the above forums were different, and so was the status of the negotiations. Some of the forums, like the UN General Assembly, could only discuss matters raised by the states and adopt resolutions merely in the nature of a recommendation. Others worked out the texts of future treaties, conventions and agreements on questions of disarmament. Here and there, the negotiations made visible progress; other negotiations were at the stage of examin-

ing key provisions of the intended agreements. There were also negotiations at which all the basic work had still to be tackled.

All the same, the expanding dialogue concerning a broad spectrum of disarmament issues inspired much hope. It spoke of the prevailing appreciation of the need for adding military to political detente, of the importance of securing concrete understandings on the curbing of the arms race. That is why the signing of the treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive arms (SALT-2) by the Soviet Union and the United States in Vienna in the summer of 1979 won such a broad positive response all over the world. It was the consensus that the treaty met the interests not only of the two signatories, but also those of all nations, because it was centred on buttressing international security as a whole, and on lessening the threat of nuclear war. That was also the time when the Soviet-American talks on the prohibition of new types of mass destruction weapons were successfully completed, leading up to the elaboration of the essential elements of a treaty banning radiological weapons, duly submitted to the Disarmament Committee.

The positive development of the process of military detente was not, however, to the liking of the devotees of the arms race. They saw this turn of events as a direct threat to their interests. And their negative attitude to detente in international relations generally, and to disarmament negotiations in particular, began to surface more and more distinctly in the foreign policy of the leading capitalist states, notably the USA.

No sooner the SALT-2 Treaty was signed than certain elements in the United States set about discrediting it, and used the ratification process to complicate its entry into force. In early 1980, the US President indefinitely deferred the examination of the Treaty in the Senate, thereby delivering a painful blow to bilateral strategic arms limitation talks, and to restriction of the arms race in general.

The US line of cutting back dialogue on questions of military detente spread to other Soviet-American negotiations. At the end of 1978, the USA unilaterally broke off Soviet-American talks on restriction of the arms trade. The talks with the Soviet Union on anti-satellites and on making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace came to a halt through the fault of the United States in 1979. In May 1980, the United States broke off the negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons, and at the end of the year suspended the tripartite Soviet-Anglo-Amer-

ican negotiations on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests.

In sum, by 1981 the government of the United States had, in contravention of existing accords and in defiance of the many resolutions of the UN General Assembly and the appeals of the world community, suspended dialogue with the Soviet Union launched in the seventies on many crucial issues of military detente. The negative character of these unilateral US actions is all the more apparent because some of the above-mentioned negotiations had registered significant progress. Take the Soviet-American negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons that were conducted since 1976. During the thirteen rounds of these talks the sides had in principle agreed on the universality of the chemical weapons prohibition. They had agreed that in addition to the criterion of the general aim it was desirable to apply the criterion of toxicity. The positions on the question of verification, too, had moved a little closer together, and so on.

The progress secured at the Soviet-American negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons won the full approbation of the Committee on Disarmament, to which the USSR and US delegations submitted joint accounts of the results in July 1979 and June 1980. These progress reports, indeed, became the basis for multilateral negotiations concerning the chemical weapons ban within the Disarmament Committee itself.

Important work had also been accomplished in the context of the Soviet-Anglo-American talks on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests. In over three years of negotiation, the parties to the tripartite talks succeeded in finding answers to many complex aspects of the problem, holding out the promise of successful completion. Much that was useful had also been accomplished during exchanges of opinion between the delegations of the USSR and the USA at other bilateral negotiations.

Ever since the USA blocked many important Soviet-American channels of negotiations and contacts, the only remaining forum in which the states are committed to negotiate on questions of military detente has been the Committee on Disarmament. Since 1979, that body has been composed of all the five nuclear powers and the militarily most highly developed states. Its agenda includes the most topical issues of military detente. Its rules of procedure and organisation are geared to the basic purpose of all its activity: for all the states that have gath-

ered on a basis of equal rights to draw up international instruments—agreements, conventions and treaties—of an obligatory nature.

Despite all these premises, the Disarmament Committee has been on a treadmill of late. As at many other international forums, the keen contention of the two main trends in world politics, of the two approaches to disarmament negotiations, has also come to the fore in the Committee—the line of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community to hold down the arms race and to reach tangible results in the field of disarmament, on the one hand, and the line of the USA and its leading NATO partners, on the other, designed to justify the militarist policies of Washington and the bloc as a whole and to drag out or torpedo negotiations.

In their bid to distract the Committee from performing its immediate tasks, the USA and certain of its NATO allies impose discussion of matters that have no bearing at all on the functions of the Committee, fruitless procedural debates, and the like. The foes of military detente have mounted a head-on attack on the very possibility of businesslike dialogue concerning topical problems of disarmament.

More than three years ago the Soviet Union, backed by other socialist countries, came forward with the proposal for ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until their final elimination. There is also a whole series of UN resolutions, including that on the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament, calling on the Geneva Committee to start negotiating a stop to the nuclear arms race without further delay. Yet no such negotiations are being conducted in the Committee. The reason is the resistance of the USA and its allies, who allege that negotiations of that sort are “premature”. This wholly spurious pretext is being used to obstruct dialogue on one of the most topical aspects of disarmament.

Or take another issue—the reinforcement of security guarantees to non-nuclear states. A draft international convention on this score drawn up jointly by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries has been put on the negotiating table in the Committee. A draft convention has also been submitted by the non-aligned states. Besides, there exist no few resolutions of the General Assembly calling for an international convention. But in spite of this practically no work on the drafts is being done by the Committee. And for the same old reason: the resistance of the USA and its allies, who allege that working out

an international convention to reinforce security guarantees to non-nuclear states is an "unrealistic" venture.

A similarly spurious pretext is being advanced by the US representatives and their Western colleagues to prevent examination of the Soviet proposal for the prohibition of the development and production of new types and systems of mass destruction weapons and of the pertinent draft treaty. Disquisitions by Western spokesmen on the "irrelevance" of this question are accompanied, according to press reports, by crash development of new lethal types of weapons in the United States and certain other Western countries.

For years, the world public has called insistently for the prohibition of neutron munitions. The Soviet Union, jointly with other socialist countries, has submitted a draft treaty on this subject to the Disarmament Committee. In view of US President Reagan's decision to proceed with the full-scale production of neutron bombs, the issue has become doubly topical, as has indeed been stated by representatives of the non-aligned, as well as socialist, countries. But here again the American "veto", backed by allies of the USA, is preventing the Committee from elaborating measures that would prohibit neutron munitions.

The foes of military detente, as we see, have not only taken the bilateral arms limitation dialogue back to square one, but are also trying to spike multilateral talks on various aspects of disarmament. Furthermore, they are trying to cast doubt on existing international accords in the field of disarmament. The aims reach far: to disrupt the front of fighters for disarmament, to shake their confidence in the lofty ideals of a world without war and without arms, and to clear the path for one more dangerous twist of the arms race.

Take the example of the slander campaign of recent years in the US press, joined by some media of bourgeois propaganda elsewhere, to the effect that Soviet army units in Afghanistan and Vietnamese troops in Laos and Kampuchea have employed chemical weapons in contravention of the 1925 Geneva Protocol, and that the Soviet Union is priming for chemical and bacteriological warfare. The USA launched the campaign in order to distract attention from its own wide use of chemical weapons and from its own intensified preparations in this field.

According to estimates of an academic conference held in Paris in 1970, in which US experts also took part, US armed forces had sprayed 13,000 sq km or 43 per cent of arable land and 25,000 sq km or

14 per cent of forestland in South Vietnam alone with toxic substances from 1961 to 1969. More than 100,000 tons of toxic agents had been used. Two million people sustained injuries, out of which 3,500 were fatal.

Not until 1975, after a delay of fifty years, did the United States accede to the Geneva Protocol banning the use of chemical weapons. At the same time, however, Washington set in motion a series of long-term programmes providing for the development of new types of chemical weapons, notably of what is known as the binary weapon.

The USA has also assailed some other international disarmament instruments—the convention on the prohibition of bacteriological (biological) weapons, and certain Soviet-American agreements. Demands for “international investigation” of various trumped-up violations were accompanied with a variety of unrealistic proposals for setting up international control agencies to verify fulfilment of present and future disarmament agreements. Back again is the tactic of obfuscating the substance of negotiations and torpedoing talks by exaggerated demands concerning control.

The US line of folding the disarmament dialogue gave rise to a number of presidential directives in Carter’s time. In September 1979, the Western press reported that Carter had issued a directive that the USA should not enter into any new disarmament talks until it was absolutely sure that they would not injure the many US military programmes. Under this directive, all arms control proposals should meet the following criteria, among others: they must be compatible with US military aims, and ensure Western military superiority over their rivals, that is, the countries of the socialist community.

In early 1980, the US President instructed the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to scale down its activity. Since 1981, when there was a “change of guards” in the agency, with men known to have been devotees of the arms race taking the helm, the body has done nothing that could have furthered disarmament negotiations.

The world public is incensed by the posture of the foes of effective dialogue concerning military detente. Suffice it to say that in just six months in 1981, the Disarmament Committee received more than 7,000 letters from public bodies and from individuals calling for resumption of the interrupted Soviet-American dialogue, and for enlivening current negotiations to secure arms limitation agreements without further delay in order to avert the danger of nuclear war.

It was only natural that in 1981, at the 36th UN General Assembly and in the Disarmament Committee, neutral and non-aligned states were far more critical than before of US policy and that of its allies, denouncing US militarist doctrines and, especially, the concept of "limited nuclear war". Matters came to a point, in fact, where certain non-aligned spokesmen questioned the compatibility of US policy with US participation in the work of the Disarmament Committee. There could be no clearer evidence of the concern felt by a large number of countries over the grave consequences that the activity of the foes of detente, the large-scale new US military preparations, and the war psychosis fanned by aggressive imperialist circles and reminiscent of cold war times, could entail for international security.

That most of the participants in the discussion of disarmament issues at the 36th UN General Assembly favoured renewal and intensification of the arms control dialogue is also a salient point. The Assembly called for Soviet-US negotiations to continue the process that had begun with the SALT-1 agreement and the signing of SALT-2 in accordance with the principle of equality and equal security. Nearly a score of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly contain demands that talks should be held on specific aspects of holding down the arms race and furthering disarmament.

The interest shown by the Soviet Union in military detente is well known. The USSR has reasserted this interest time and again by its deeds. In the complicated international situation that has arisen through the fault of the imperialist states it is essential to apply every possible effort to halt the drift towards another cold war and to ensure normal peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. The only solution are negotiations based on strict adherence to the principle of equality and equal security. The dangerous course of the foes of dialogue has got to be countered by a united front of all world forces aspiring to peace and to more solid international security.

From the rostrum of the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Leonid Brezhnev has declared Soviet readiness to continue strategic arms limitation talks with the USA, preserving all the positive elements achieved in this field so far. He also stressed Soviet readiness to come to terms on other issues of military detente. The concrete proposals advanced at the Congress for safeguarding peace and curbing the arms race are a good basis for businesslike and constructive dialogue at various international forums.

ANTI-WAR MOVEMENT

THE CURRENT ANTI-WAR MOVEMENT— A CRUCIAL FACTOR IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

VITALY SHAPOSHNIKOV

Party worker and publicist, b. 1921. Veteran of the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945. Finished the philological department of Saratov University. Deputy Chief of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, member of the World Peace Council Bureau, member of the Bureau of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation, and member of the Bureau of the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament.

Vitaly Shaposhnikov has written extensively on topics related to the struggle for detente and the part played by the public at large in the fight for peace and international co-operation.

The attention of the world public is riveted to questions of war and peace. More and more people in various countries have come to realise that international developments have reached a highly responsible period and that, to a vast degree, further progress towards the maintenance and strengthening of detente depends on their own efforts lest matters turn back to cold war, which is now far more dangerous than before.

Of late, the anti-war movement has gained so much in scale, and has assumed a character that may be safely described as a qualitatively new stage. This applies first of all to the countries in Western Europe, where strong protests are being voiced against the dangerous NATO plans of stationing new US medium-range missiles in a number of West European countries and against the White House decision to launch full-scale production of neutron munitions and development of new types of chemical weapons.

The salient feature of the anti-war movement today is the steady expansion of its social-political base. Besides the Communists, it has been joined by influential sections of social-democratic, liberal and certain bourgeois political parties, the trade unions, and women's and youth organisations of different persuasions. It has also been joined by environmentalist groups, by businessmen's organisations, various pacifist bodies, by writers and artists, and by members of parliaments.

Prominent scientists from various countries, specialists in a wide range of fields and representing major scientific centres, are taking an active part in the anti-war movement. The movement of physicians for the prevention of nuclear war is gaining in scale. In recent months, physicians have set up special organisations in various countries, and have held national and international conferences to give voice to their alarm over the future of peace, of humankind and all living things on Earth. Authoritative spokesmen of the medical world have expressed their determination to apply the maximum effort to prevent a nuclear disaster, and to warn the nations of its consequences.

What strikes the eye too, is that military men, including some who had only recently occupied prominent posts in NATO, are taking part in the anti-war movement—a thing that has never been observed before. World-wide attention was attracted by the anti-war pronouncements of the Italian general Nino Pasti, the Portuguese marshal Francisco da Costa Gomes, the West German general Gert Bastian, the Greek general Georgios Koumanakos, the US admiral Gene Robert Laroque, and the French admiral Antoine Sanguinetti. Many influential sections of the ruling class in the capitalist states are soberly facing up to the realities of today and raising their voices against the threat of nuclear holocaust and for the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems as the sole alternative to war. Another typical point is that even within some strongly conservative political parties and organisations factions have come into being that want a considered approach to international affairs and a stop to the arms race which is fraught with unpredictable consequences. Various religious organisations are coming forward with similar demands.

To be sure, these new features in the character and structure of the anti-war movement have not cancelled out the fundamental ideological and political distinctions between its separate detachments.

It is politically naive to ascribe the activity of so broad a movement to any guidance from some single international or national centre. And the collapse of bourgeois propaganda attempts to portray the anti-war actions as "communist-inspired" is entirely understandable.

The activation of various peace groups and organisations stems above all from the deterioration of the international situation, and the appreciation of the fact that the plans of the Pentagon and NATO are pregnant with the threat of nuclear war for Western Europe and other regions of the world. The recklessly tough line of the US Administration, as ever broader sections of the public see it, could turn Europe, and not Europe alone, into a war theatre involving use of nuclear weapons. Neither have people forgotten the beneficial effects of detente, which had not only scaled down the war threat and inspired hopes of a peaceful future, but had also yielded immediate benefits through the broader economic, scientific and technical, cultural and other ties between states irrespective of their social system.

The consistent Soviet policy of peace, the foreign policy initiatives of the 26th Congress of the CPSU, which are designed to improve the situation in Europe and on the international scene as a whole, offer the peace forces the perspective of reversing the prevailing situation. In such circumstances, knowledge of the catastrophic consequences of nuclear war acts not as a damper but a catalyst of public action.

The mood of the masses is also influenced by the fact that in the present state of economic and structural crises gripping the capitalist world, the spending on social and cultural needs is being cut back while military budgets are spiralling. The success of the struggle for continued detente, for peaceful international relations, and for the immediate social and economic demands of the working people, depends in many ways on the consistency and resolution of the actions against war preparations. In the present conditions, these two aspects are most intimately linked.

Worthy of note is the extremely wide range of slogans advanced by various detachments of the anti-war movement. That, too, is a distinctive feature. The main thrust in all of them is directed to preventing the deployment in Western Europe of new medium-range US missiles and to prohibiting the manufacture of the barbarous neutron bomb.

In the early stage of the anti-missile movement (the latter half and especially the end of 1979), its participants did not succeed in preventing the adoption by NATO of its nuclear-missile decisions. But they did achieve some results. Under public pressure, the governments of Belgium and the Netherlands—two of the five countries in which the new weapons were to have been sited—had put off their decision on the matter. The mass actions and discussions at various forums displayed a considerable degree of agreement among various political trends and their appreciation of the special danger that the NATO decisions held for densely-populated Western Europe. This was the foundation on which the peace forces launched active efforts to further marshal the peoples for the struggle against the new US weapons.

In the early eighties the movement grew so much as to become an increasingly effective barrier to the implementation of the NATO decisions. The special department of NATO headquarters engaged in war propaganda has even drawn up a directive circulated among the governments of all the fifteen NATO member-countries, urging them to take action against the anti-war movement.

But efforts to stem the mass protest against the arms race have failed. And the US Administration's decision to begin full-scale manufacture of neutron munitions has set off a new groundswell. The US move says a statement of the World Peace Council, threatens general security and is dragging the world still closer to thermonuclear catastrophe. A statement of Norway's Arbeiderpartiet (Labour Party) expresses concern that the US decision may jeopardise negotiations on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe. Michael Foot, leader of the British Labour Party, pointed out that the arms race has reached a point where the decision on producing the neutron bomb seems to be the worst decision taken by Reagan since he moved into the White House. The Labour Party conference in September 1981 came out with a sharp anti-war resolution. The Communists of the FRG, said Chairman of the German Communist Party Herbert Mies, are determined, in common with all other democratic forces, to step up the fight for peace and disarmament, and against the stationing of US nuclear missiles and neutron bomb in the Federal Republic of Germany.

The White House decision to launch full-scale manufacture of neutron munitions is seen not only as a challenge to European and world opinion, but also as a snub to America's NATO allies, which

had not even been consulted on this issue of vital importance for Western Europe.

The anti-war movement in the FRG is on the upgrade, and that country is central to the implementation of NATO's militarist plans. The scale of the movement had not been anywhere close to what it is now either at the time of the acrimonious debate of the fifties over the establishment of the Bundeswehr or during the actions against the neutron bomb in the latter half of the seventies. The movement is spreading to ever broader and more diverse sections of the population, and is becoming a truly nation-wide movement. The discussion triggered by the impending deployment of new US nuclear missiles has helped to bring closer the positions of various organisations fighting for peace, detente, and disarmament. The public in the FRG refuses to be a passive object of manipulation, and is taking the road of independent action.

The grass roots movement against NATO's missile decisions is gaining ever broader scale. Besides the FRG, it encompasses Britain, the Netherlands, Belgium, Portugal, Norway, Denmark, and a number of other countries. The demand not to deploy new US weapons in Western Europe blends with specific local slogans.

Actions for nuclear-free zones have proliferated. The public's fight for a nuclear-free zone in Northern Europe has gained in scale (though, as it will be recalled, Urho Kekkonen initiated the idea as far back as 19 years ago). A consultative meeting of peace organisations, which gathered in Helsinki in August 1981, called on the governments concerned to work out practical measures for a nuclear-free zone in Northern Europe.

Fresh impulse for public action was given by Leonid Brezhnev's replies to the correspondent of Finland's *Suomen Sosialidemokraatti* concerning the Soviet attitude towards the possibility of a nuclear-free zone in the North of Europe. Villun Hansen, Chairman of the Danish Committee of Co-operation for Peace and Security, said the public welcomed the proposal of the Soviet head of state concerning non-use of nuclear weapons against North European countries party to the nuclear-free zone. The Soviet Union has not ruled out the possibility of examining other measures applying to Soviet territory adjoining the nuclear-free zone in Northern Europe. This important statement, said Hansen, should be seen by the governments in the region as a concrete Soviet proposal to jointly avert a military

disaster and to make Northern Europe a zone of guaranteed stability.

At a conference on nuclear war in Europe, held in Groningen in April 1981, prominent scholars and public leaders from Western Europe and the United States said a nuclear-free zone stretching across Europe from Portugal to Poland would greatly help to eliminate the war threat. The slogan, "A Europe Free of Nuclear Weapons from Poland to Portugal and from Italy to Ireland", is seen more frequently nowadays at mass anti-war demonstrations in Western countries, especially Belgium, Portugal, the FRG, and Greece. It was also extensively advocated by Peace March-81 from Copenhagen to Paris. All along its route, the marchers voiced their resolute opposition to Pentagon and NATO plans of stationing new US missiles in Western Europe. Protests against these dangerous plans were also voiced by participants in the Perugia-Assisi, Italy, peace march in September 1981. Large-scale public actions were seen during the Week of Action for Disarmament at the end of October 1981. Huge demonstrations were held in Paris, Rome, Madrid, Oslo, Tokyo, Vienna, Brussels, and London. The mass demonstration in Amsterdam at the end of November 1981 was one of the largest protest actions against the US-inspired race of nuclear arms.

International and national public organisations, and political leaders, expressed their satisfaction that Soviet-American negotiations on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe had begun in Geneva on November 30, 1981. Great hopes are pinned on them. But there is serious anxiety over the US approach. This anxiety has redoubled when the public learned of the posture of US spokesmen at various NATO sitings in Brussels in December 1981. Neither did the public overlook the statement of US Secretary of State Alexander Haig, specially timed to coincide with the opening of the Geneva talks, in which he emphasised NATO's determination to continue preparations for the deployment of new missiles.

Stressing the importance of the Geneva negotiations, World Peace Council President Romesh Chandra said: "It is gratifying that a decision has been taken to begin talks on the medium-range missiles deployed in Europe. But the peoples are adamant on the point that these talks must not be reduced to a delaying tactic; they must lead to the removal of the very discernible threat of war. The world cannot approve talks that will only postpone the use of weapons that can destroy

us twenty times over. These must be talks that will limit armaments today and lead to the total prohibition of nuclear and all other weapons of mass destruction.”¹

This coincides entirely with the aspirations of the Soviet side, as demonstrated by the far-reaching new proposals made during Leonid Brezhnev’s visit to the FRG in November (22-25) 1981. “Indeed,” said Leonid Brezhnev in his speech in Bonn, “we are in favour of Europe finally becoming free of nuclear weapons—both of medium range and tactical. That, to be sure, would be a real ‘zero option’ fair to all sides.”²

The Soviet peace initiatives are in harmony with the sentiments of broad masses of people. They conform with the peace demands of the general public, and it was therefore only natural that Leonid Brezhnev’s visit to the FRG, a mission of peace in the fullest and finest sense of the word, elicited so broad a response.

The fight to end the arms race is not confined to Western Europe alone. Other countries are involved in it. Recent facts show that anti-war sentiment is growing in the United States. The same may be said of Canada where, among other things, a peace committee has been set up in the trade union framework. Its purpose is to enlist the greatest possible masses, above all the unions, in promoting limitation of the arms race. It has come out against the US intention of stationing new US medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe.

A national council for peace, democracy and progressive unity has been formed in Japan. All prefectures, and nearly a thousand public organisations, are represented on it, numbering some 3.9 million people. As noted in its inaugural resolution, it sees its main purpose in promoting discussion of important political problems and furthering co-operation of all progressive forces in joint actions against war and for the people’s democratic rights.

The public at large responded with gratification to the appeal of the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace which convened in Sofia in September 1980. Though its documents have no legal force, they exercise a tremendous moral influence as an expression of the

¹ *World Marxist Review*, No. 12, December 1981, p. 8.

² *Pravda*, November 24, 1981.

will of the peoples, and have marshalled millions of men and women to join in the struggle for peace.

The Appeal of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR to the Parliaments and Peoples of the World, calling for every possible action to save humankind from nuclear suicide, to assert peace, to secure the triumph of concord and co-operation among nations, was well received by the public everywhere. The cardinal importance and timeliness of the Appeal was emphasised, among others, by participants in the session in Brussels of the Secretariat of the International Committee for European Security and Co-operation in early July 1981.

A considerable contribution to the anti-war movement was made in 1981 by the international Science and Disarmament Colloquium in Paris (January), the sittings of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, an international body known as the Palme Commission which held eight sittings that year, the last one in Tokyo (December), the international conferences against the arms race and for disarmament in Stockholm (June), and for the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Tokyo, Nagasaki and Hiroshima (August), the International Miners Conference on Peace and Disarmament in Newcastle, Britain (November), the World Trade Union Conference on Social and Economic Aspects of Disarmament in Paris (December), and many others.

The growth of the movement against the arms race, and the growing number of peace fighters, is an important and noteworthy development. Still, the movement is not without its problems. Difficulties have arisen, for example, over the dual position of the social-democratic leaders, which became more and more apparent as large sections of Socialists joined the movement. Fearing that the rank and file of their parties would move still closer to the Communists in the fight for peace, some social-democratic leaders inclined towards forming "alternative" peace organisations.

It stands to reason that this course of action is contrary to the imperative of unity on a general democratic platform of struggle for the consolidation of peace, and against the threat of nuclear war. In the highly complicated international situation of today it is much more important for the Social Democrats, as well as the Communists, to stress the elements they have in common, and to work for broader co-operation with each other and with other political forces in the struggle for peace and disarmament.

The standpoint of the CPSU on co-operation with the Social Democrats was in principle defined in Leonid Brezhnev's report to the 26th Congress of the Communist Party. Present-day social democracy, he noted, has considerable political weight. It could do more for the defence of the vital interests of the peoples and, above all, for the consolidation of peace. In practice, however, the social-democratic leaders do not always act along these lines. Many of them are afflicted with the virus of anti-communism and allow themselves to be drawn into campaigns organised by imperialists against the socialist countries. "But we will actively support all steps that are beneficial to peace and democracy," Brezhnev said. "In view of the present complication of the international situation, we attach importance to cooperation with Social Democrats, trade unions, religious circles, and all democratic and peace-loving forces in the matter of preventing war and strengthening peace."¹

Present-day international relations are increasingly influenced by the peoples of the developing countries, which need peace in order to solve their social and economic problems. Many peace moves have, indeed, been initiated by the non-aligned movement. The positive role of the developing countries, first of all those of socialist orientation, in the United Nations is growing steadily.

A certain section of the public in the developing countries seems to think, however, that nuclear war, if it breaks out, will not affect them. Some even go so far as to use the global confrontation of the two systems for narrow national aims.

On the whole, however, good objective opportunities exist in Asia, Africa and Latin America for a further growth of the anti-war movement. They stem from the close connection between safeguarding peace, relieving international tensions and bridling the arms race, and the matter of consolidating the political and economic independence of the countries of these regions. They derive, too, from the ever growing understanding in the Asian, African, and Latin American countries—and this at government as well as grass roots levels—that by declaring whole regions of the world to be zones of strategic interest to them, the US imperialists are making them targets of actual or potential military interference.

The aims of the anti-war movement in Europe are closely linked

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. . .*, p. 25.

with the struggle of the peoples for peaceful political settlement of conflicts in various parts of the world.

The scale of the fight for the preservation and consolidation of détente, and against the arms race, shows that the future of peace troubles broad sections of the people in all regions and on all continents. Their demands testify to the fact that they understand more and more clearly where the danger is coming from. The present-day anti-war movement is growing into an increasingly effective and influential factor of international relations.

THE WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT IN DEVELOPED CAPITALIST COUNTRIES FIGHTS FOR PEACE

GHERMAN DILIGENSKY, Dr. Sc. (Hist.), YEVGENY YAROPOLOV, Cand. Sc. (Hist.)

Professor *Gherman Diligensky*, b. 1930, historian and sociologist, finished the Moscow University History Department in 1952. He is head of a department of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, the USSR Academy of Sciences, member of commissions of the Soviet Peace Committee and the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation.

He has written extensively on the present-day working-class movement, the sociology and psychology of large social groups, and the theory of requirements.

Yevgeny Yaropolov, b. 1941, finished the Moscow University History Department in 1964. He is head of a research group at the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Author of a number of works on the mass working-class and democratic movement and the political problems of capitalist states.

The fight for peace and detente ranks high on the list of priorities of the working class in developed capitalist countries.

The battle is fought under difficult conditions. Crisis processes convulsing the world capitalist economy have resulted in a further worsening of the social conflicts of capitalism, increased its socio-political instability and deeply affected the mentality of bourgeois society. The "affluent society" and "consumer society" theories, much advertised by state-monopoly capitalism, have proved futile, as have slogans of "quality of life" and of aligning economic growth with "human" goals. The traditional problems of capitalism are back again.

This applies above all to employment. In most capitalist countries the number of unemployed has been increasing and has reached an unprecedented high since the end of the war. Members of highly-qualified mental labour are losing their jobs, as well as workers in "obsolete" industries and trades—and among them young people and school-leavers. This has resulted in the growth of declassé elements, who are a nutrient medium for crime and other anti-social activity. In some countries, right and left extremists try to use the demoralisation of unemployed youth, its protest against the existing order for their own ends.

To combat the crisis and its effects, capitalist governments resort to what they call austerity programmes, meaning retrenchments and reductions in social spending. This leads to a further deterioration of the housing problem, health care and education, and depresses working people's incomes.

Cut-backs in social spending are but one aspect of state-monopoly capitalism's changed internal political strategy which took root in the late seventies and the early eighties. The essence of this strategy is a tougher political line, a more authoritarian policy, and "firmness" in relations with the organised working class. Imperialist reaction is trying to use the economic difficulties for a shift to the right in political life, and for organising a general offensive on democratic rights and freedoms. Bourgeois ideologues and propagandists blame the difficulties on the working-class movement and its allegedly excessive demands, and strike out against the social reforms (no matter how half-baked) that were carried out in the past under the pressure of the working people. The reactionary elements make use of the growing instability of the social and economic position of the masses, uncertainty in the future, to propagate conservative political views and to discredit progressive social programmes.

The cyclical crises of overproduction and the concomitant growth of unemployment worsen the objective conditions of the class struggle, with the bourgeoisie seizing on the chance to scale down the strike movement. Nevertheless, in most capitalist countries the level of the strike movement remains high enough.

The development of internal contradictions of capitalism was closely linked with processes in international politics. The cold war gave capitalism broad opportunities to hold back the aggravation of social conflicts by distracting the working people from their economic and

social problems. Detente tended to deprive capitalism of these opportunities. In recent years, there has been a growing tendency to dampen the mass social protest by undermining detente and whipping up anti-Sovietism. Reactionary bourgeois forces attempt to distract the working people from domestic problems with the help of anti-Sovietism, and thereby create optimal conditions for curbing working-class and general democratic movements, and intensifying the arms race. The deterioration of the international situation has enabled right-wing forces and big capital to broaden their offensive on the democratic rights of the working people, making use of chauvinistic sentiments and war psychosis to strengthen their position and do away with their political opponents.

That is why the connection between the workers' struggle for their rights and against another war, for disarmament, is now becoming ever more obvious, that is, the drive for peace and disarmament is ever more closely intertwined with the fight to protect social gains. It may be said that today more than ever, the fight for peace is becoming an inseparable component of the class struggle on the international scene, and the movement for social progress. In our time, the working class, which has always opposed militarism and war, is the most consistent fighter for the strengthening of detente, demonstrating how closely its class interests are linked with the interests of humanity as a whole.

This link between the struggle to solve social, economic and internal political problems and the struggle for peace materialises in a growing strike action and an upswing of the anti-war movement.

It should be noted, however, that the struggle against the war danger faces considerable difficulties. In a number of countries, for instance, pessimism and depression have immobilised people on account of the widespread belief that a nuclear conflict is inevitable. Naturally, this is playing into the hands of the opponents of detente.

The anti-war activity of communist parties, the vanguard of the working class, is therefore especially important. The role of the communist parties as the most active force in the struggle for peace, in mobilising the masses to oppose the plans of domestic and international reaction, has now grown immensely. The communist parties strive to show that the public is able to influence the course of events, the foreign policies of parliaments and governments, and to contribute to improving the prospects of peace and international co-operation. The

Communists make a special point of showing how important it is for every man and woman to take part in the movement against any policy that increases the war danger. The broader and the more massive the public actions are, the stronger and more effective this influence will be. The Communists, together with the politically conscious sections of the working class, are exposing the myth of a "Soviet threat" planted in people's minds by the powerful bourgeois propaganda machine and the mass media of the ruling class. The myths of "Soviet expansionism", "the hand of Moscow", and so on, which are a basic element of modern militarist propaganda, help to camouflage the true causes of the social conflict and the contradictions in the capitalist world, and to distort the motives behind the revolutionary liberation struggle of the masses. To inform the general public about the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union, to explain the Soviet stand on basic and urgent international problems, would help greatly to overcome anti-Soviet prejudices and strengthen the hand of the peace champions.

Many communist parties have put forward well-grounded proposals on converting the war industry to civilian production. The Communists consider this a most important objective, because the view that the war industry ensures high employment, cultivated by bourgeois propaganda, and the fear of losing one's job are still a serious deterrent in the fight against the arms race.

The communist parties furnish convincing proof that renunciation of the non-productive expenditure related to the arms build-up and gradual transfer of capital to civilian industries would in no way affect employment and would, on the contrary, create a large number of new jobs.

The arms race is undermining the outlook for peaceful development and jeopardises the very survival of whole nations. The material preparations for war are a heavy burden for the working people. The Communists, supported by broad sections of the public, exert pressure on their governments to divert resources earmarked for military purposes to social needs.

The pivot of the foreign policy programmes of communist parties is the struggle against the deployment of new US medium-range missiles in Western Europe, against the neutron bomb, and for disarmament, for resumption of talks between East and West, and for saving detente.

These calls find a broad response. In their everyday work, the Com-

munists carry forward their resolutions on this score, and make use of various forms of struggle. In several countries, particularly in Italy and the FRG, the fight for peace is being linked ever more closely with the struggle against fascism.

Regional and international meetings of communist and workers' parties, such as the Berlin Conference of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe (1976) and their Paris Meeting for Peace and Disarmament (1980), have played an important part in formulating the foreign policy goals of the working-class movement. A lively and constructive exchange of opinions at international meetings and conferences, multilateral and bilateral meetings, and collective documents help to mobilise the world public to fight for peace, detente and disarmament. Every meeting and document is followed by actions involving millions of people.

At their Paris meeting, the Communists declared that they would continue their efforts to strengthen peace, to advance the policy of detente and to achieve practical results in disarmament. The participants confirmed that they were willing to co-operate in these efforts with all parties and mass organisations which aspire to peace and disarmament, and to establish broad contacts and dialogue with all peace movements and democratic forces without exception. This appeal provides a sound basis for such contacts. The appeal reaffirms that "Communists of all the European countries are ready, when it is a matter of the struggle for peace and disarmament, for any dialogue, for any talks, and for any joint action. We want all the peace forces to unite with this aim in view. Whatever our nationality, our convictions or our way of life, we say to you all—Communists, Socialists, Social-Democrats, christians, people of other religions: 'Peace is our common birthright'."¹

Today, as never before, it is necessary to join the efforts of the peace forces in opposing the dangerous imperialist policy and preventing resumption of cold war and aggravation of the threat of war. Co-operation of Communists with other contingents of the working-class movement, notably the social-democratic (socialist) parties, is highly important. For the Communists, alliance of the left forces is not a short-term task determined by the situation, nor a tactical

¹ *Meeting of European Communist and Workers' Parties for Peace and Disarmament, Paris, 28-29 April 1980*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1980, p. 14.

device, but a basic guideline for mobilising the masses in the fight for peace, for transforming society.

Recent years have witnessed some changes in the social-democratic movement, a revision of some outdated dogmas, and more vigorous activity, particularly in the field of foreign policy. Though inconsistency and ambiguity is still felt in the political line of social-democratic parties, joint action by Communists and Socialists is developing gradually not only at national but also international level. And communist parties proceed on the assumption that activity at either of these levels stimulates activity at both of them. The fight for unity launched in the sixties mainly within national boundaries, was a most important factor in the early seventies, paving the way for concrete actions in the struggle for unity internationally. It is likewise evident that the achievements of international activity have created more favourable conditions for the drive for unity. The following specific feature, however, may be observed. Some social-democratic parties that expressed readiness for dialogue at international level proved the least ready for such dialogue at national level. The reason for this may be traced to the unbalanced evolution of the foreign policy and socio-economic positions within a number of parties.

Back in the seventies the struggle for detente became a basis for joint action, and social democracy demonstrated that its positions had undergone considerable change. At present, the parties of the Socialist International support the policy of detente. Leading Social Democrats have emphasised again and again that there is no alternative to the policy of peace, for otherwise humanity will be driven to the brink of destruction. The parties of the Socialist International support disarmament, and communist and social-democratic parties hold similar views on the importance and urgency of this problem. Since foreign policy was traditionally an area where Communists and Social Democrats clashed, the drawing together of views on these issues augments the chances of contacts. Whereas the cold war and the logic of relations engendered by it, in fact, automatically aggravated the split in the working-class and democratic movement, the crisis of the cold war policy that began in the late sixties, the growing opposition to this policy and its rejection by the broad masses, created more favourable conditions for the struggle for unity and co-operation of all democratic and socialist forces in the interests of peace and the security of nations.

One should not overlook the fact, of course, that some social-democratic parties tend to support the policy of the bourgeois ruling circles aimed at intensifying the arms race. The seventies, however, brought ample positive experience of co-operation between Socialists and Communists. Besides, so deep are the roots of detente in all sections of society that the current sharp deterioration of the international climate has impelled many Social Democrats to seek rapprochement with all peace and democratic forces, including the Communists.

Under the new conditions, in the face of the vigorous activities of the aggressive forces and the growing danger from the right in many countries, Communists and Socialists could wage a common or co-ordinated struggle in the international arena to tackle the most urgent problems, co-operating in their efforts to maintain and deepen detente, to curb the arms race and achieve disarmament under effective control, to secure the destruction of nuclear stockpiles, and establish a reliable system of international security in Europe and all over the world. Active and effective participation of Social Democrats in this struggle would further the vital interests of the working people. The more vigorous and concrete the efforts for peace by the social-democratic parties and their leaders, the greater the support they are sure to gain from the democratic public in their countries.

Important areas of co-operation where coinciding views of Communists and Socialists are beginning to show are: solidarity with the peoples fighting against racism and colonialism; the fight for the democratisation of international economic relations, and the efforts to resolve ecological, energy and other urgent problems facing mankind.

Unity of action is often achieved in the course of the struggle to save detente. This co-operation is most impressive in a number of countries, where rank-and-file Socialists and Communists march together in anti-war demonstrations.

The two working-class parties often co-operate fruitfully in factory trade unions, drawing broad non-party working masses into the struggle for peace and disarmament. In principle, international problems have never been alien to trade unions, but until quite recently not all of them have been throwing their influence fully behind the work for peace. Previously many unions feared that disarmament would reduce employment, while others considered—and still consider—

disarmament a field outside their competence and a prerogative of political parties. Besides, owing to the aggravation of crisis elements in the economic and social life of capitalist countries, the trade union movement is concentrating its main forces on preventing the worsening of the position of the working class and on defending the rights that have already been won.

Nonetheless, since the beginning of the eighties the trade unions have been more broadly involved in anti-war actions and various activities aimed at preserving detente and halting the arms race. Many union leaders regard disarmament and arms control not only as a vitally important matter to mankind, but also as a way to improve the material and social condition of the working people, and to keep employment at its present level.

Characteristically, many trade unions are devoting special attention to the drive for converting the war industry to civilian production. This line enjoys growing support among trade union members. Demonstrations sponsored by trade unions in various countries are held more and more often under the slogans "No more billions for armaments" and "Spend on peaceful needs, not bombs".

The concern for peace felt by the workers and other working people is reflected most forcefully these days in the many meetings organised by trade unions. There is clear evidence that the trade union movement is eager to do its bit in the drive for peace.

In most developed capitalist countries, the unions, along with other working-class organisations, participate actively in the mass movements for peace which have gained considerable influence in recent years. The general public has grown conscious of the fact that there is no reasonable alternative to the policy of peaceful coexistence, and that if the political and economic advantages achieved through detente are lost, if the policy of balancing on the brink of war takes the upper hand, no one will win.

The stronger ties of the working class with other sections of the working people, and the expanded social base of its class alliances have contributed greatly to the expansion of the massive peace movement. This may be traced, too, to the increasingly anti-monopoly sentiments of farmers, intellectuals and various white-collar groups.

Notwithstanding the political distinctions, the different social interests, and the deep contradictions typical of capitalist society, the vast majority of the population is moved by the common desire to

prevent another war from ever being started, and their country from being involved in the military adventures of the USA. In the vitally important question of war and peace, the struggle for a foreign policy in the interests of the working class can yield impulses that will further co-operation between Communists, Social Democrats, trade unions, religious circles, the intelligentsia, youth and women's organisations, and also members of the bourgeoisie who follow the voice of reason,—that is, co-operation of all those who stand for peace and a guaranteed future.

Massive movements against the threat of war are gaining strength in many countries. Significantly, there is a great number of Communists, Social Democrats and trade union activists on the action committees of these movements; thereby a real and effective link is shaping between these committees and the working-class movement.

Workers took an active part in the massive anti-war actions that swept West European countries in the summer and autumn of 1981. Workers in large numbers were among those who protested against the deployment of new US missiles in Europe and against the danger of making Western Europe the staging area of a nuclear war in Peace March-81 (June-August, covering five countries), Peace March Perugia-Assisi (September, Italy), the huge demonstrations of peace champions in Rome, Bonn (October), Amsterdam (November), and so on.

Furthermore, the peace movement is promoting dialogue on detente and disarmament between diverse social, public and political forces—an important and lofty function. For nothing but dialogue and comparison of opinions and arguments can help work out common positions in the interests of the working people and produce a common platform in the struggle against war.

Characteristically, the working class and its organisations take a most active part in comparing opinions and working out a common action platform.

The political organisations of the working class seek mutual understanding with the general public of their countries, for they are aware that the working class cannot win the fight for peace, democracy and progress on its own. It is no exaggeration to say, in fact, that the working-class movement in the developed capitalist countries plays an exceptionally important role in awakening the sense of responsibility of the masses for the future of peace, and mobilising the working people to fight against the dangerous schemes of the opponents of peace.

NOT BY THE SWORD ALONE!

YURI BONDAREV

Writer, b. 1924. Fought in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-45. He graduated from the Maxim Gorky Institute of Literature in 1951. His first published work appeared in 1949, and he is the author of such well-known novels as *Battalions Request Fire Support* (1957) and *The Hot Snow* (1969). His works have been translated into 30 languages. In his novel *The Shore* (1975) the author raises the problem of humanism and the struggle for peace. His latest novel, *The Choice*, was published in 1981.

Yuri Bondarev is the First Deputy Chairman of the Board of the Russian Federation Writers' Union, a deputy of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR, and a member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR.

Only dealers in happy dreams and builders of imaginary towers argue that light and darkness must exist side by side in order to maintain the eternal equilibrium of the world. But where is it, this equilibrium? Light and darkness are locked in furious combat. The twisted face of darkness gazes out over the bloody scene, threatening the world with an agonising apocalypse, while the light shrieks in pain at human folly.

Governments and cabinets come and go, but inertia, greed, folly and self-confidence remain, as if they were man's highest achievements. Hatred, the lust for playing with power and the inexorable movement towards the end of the world appear to issue from a dull and hypnotised mind.

Conscience is each man's judge that enables one to distinguish good from evil, darkness from light, and expresses one's attitude to-

wards reality. All the great utopias, philosophies and art, all that which has been done for the good of men, was born of conscience. However, conscience became a myth in the Third Reich, which unleashed a war that swept away tens of millions.

The lesson of human pain and suffering experienced in the 1940s still has not been duly learned, and so it continues in the new forms of military violence that have become fashionable over recent decades—killing by proxy. Since the end of the Second World War there have been over a hundred major local wars and armed conflicts that have cost millions of human lives.

To this must be added the constant battle with nature, in which man violates, poisons and drains the earth, winning Pyrrhic victories in the name of greed and insane consumption. The idea of Western civilisation has become distorted; the rustle of banknotes and the melodic jingle of gold coins have replaced morality, conscience, shame, courage, faith and love. The spread of the American way of life marked the beginning of the collapse of spiritual values, whose place was taken by material possessions. Man is crushed by materialism, by the advancing army of things, which have become not only the rulers of the world, but also the masters of its soul.

The sole aim of a philistine's life has become a mad pursuit of material comfort under the merciless rule of synthetic luxury and synthetic political epithets that have accorded the throne of glory to Samuel Cohen, inventor of intense nuclear radiation weapons and the neutron bomb, the dream-come-true of the businessmen of death.

The concepts of "truth", "justice" and "mercy" often cease to have any meaning in the age of superconsumption the moment the instinct to seize, reminiscent of the heroes of Balzac, becomes operative. The banknote, raised to the eyes, blots out the sun, as it did in the days of Dostoyevsky. Every day representatives of the human race bring down disgrace upon themselves with wars, greed, murder, violence, while respectable-looking politicians from time to time demonstrate the motions of playfully halting on the brink of world catastrophe. The world is being destroyed by fear, by the philistine impoverishment of the spirit and by the nationalist passions.

Two dangers threaten mankind—a military war that destroys life, freedom and culture, and an ecological war that is a slow suicide.

If we argue that man allows evil forces to gain command over him, then we must admit that men willingly assume the role of victims

or murderers. This means that man is himself responsible for many of his own misfortunes, that nothing can be changed in this life, that men are not worthy of respect, and that the noble self-sacrifice of heroes, the ideas and achievements of philosophers and writers dedicated to the triumph of the concepts of man have all been in vain.

The optimism and pessimism of the artist are but two sides of one coin, a dialectic unity in which the one does not exclude the other. Evil is social in origin; it is not part of the natural order. Evil achieves power through violence.

It is said that when the cannons fire, the muses fall silent. However, in my opinion, this proverbial saying does not apply to the modern world. The writer is the intermediary in universal human intercourse. When the cannon start to fire, silence is the sound of death, and our silence signifies consent to war.

Clearly one of the most important tasks facing people of goodwill is to overcome political passivity, the inertia of philistines throughout the world, who with an indifference equal to their cowardice preach the convenient but ultimately criminal principle "What business is it of mine?" The ordinary people are able to see and understand what is noble, but are still unable to act, to take that first step towards good and away from the morality of the golden mean.

Someone once said in despair that for every Tolstoy there are a hundred Himmlers, and for every Mendeleyev there are a thousand Eichmanns. However, we must not lose hope. We must not, having appealed in tears to a deaf audience and heard no response, retreat into ourselves in search of a quiet refuge.

The primordial problem remains, the problem of life and death. Literature is the harmony of universal feeling and universal mind.

The key to happiness and trust has not yet been finally lost, but it may be tomorrow. The minds of men must be won over, or else the destructive powers of the greedy and pitiless lovers of power will wipe out the distinction between good and evil, and the last day will be upon us. To understand this is to act upon it.

The writers' motto remains as ever: "Not by the sword alone!"

ART AND THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE. COMMENTS BY A STAGE PRODUCER

GEORGI TOVSTONOGOV

Producer, b. 1915. In 1938 graduated from the faculty of stage management of the State Institute of Theatrical Art. From 1938 to 1946 he was the producer at the Griboyedov Russian Theatre in Tbilisi; from there he moved to the Moscow Regional Travelling Theatre, where he was producer from 1946 to 1949. In 1949 he became the chief producer at the Lenin Komsomol Theatre in Leningrad, and in 1956, the chief producer at the Gorky Academic Bolshoi Theatre of Drama in Leningrad. He was awarded the title People's Artist of the USSR in 1957. In 1960 he became professor, and in 1968 doctor of the history of art. He is also Deputy Chairman of the All-Russia Theatrical Society and a member of the International Theatre Institute. He has written a number of books on the theory and practice of stage management.

There is no phenomenon more alien to art than war. While every work of art designed to encourage humanism, love of man and realism always asserts the absolute value of each human life, of each human individual, war leads to the wholesale destruction and devaluation of human life.

However, the "muses are never silent" when war is being fought for a just cause. Tens and hundreds of novels, poems, plays and paintings have been dedicated to the heroism and patriotism of those defending freedom and independence. The Great Patriotic War produced innumerable heroes who have been described in novels, films and plays as unforgettable examples of national heroism. Though more than 35 years have passed since the end of that war, the theatre continues to stage plays dedicated to the soldier, to the moral power of a victori-

ous people, to the eternal memory of heroes known and unknown, who sacrificed their lives for their country and future generations.

Such productions are essentially works in praise of peace. The deprivation, hunger and dislocation caused by war give rise to an unquenchable desire for clear skies for oneself and one's children, a desire to value the life given to each individual once only, and given him so that he may work and create, enjoy the advent of spring, the sound of bird-song, the splash of water, the rustle of leaves and the perfume of flowers.

We sometimes forget how young our country is and how much has been achieved during its short history. Our concerns are many—the concern for peace, for the present day, for the defence of our country, for our people and each Soviet citizen. The life of society and of each individual are for us inseparable. We have always been strong in our unity, in our sense of togetherness. Nonetheless, our Party always recognises the absolute value of the individual, of human personality, and always views the collective as an association of diverse individuals, each of whom is unique and inimitable. It is just like in the theatre company, where the ideal is a team of talented actors, a team of stars. Only a theatre of this kind can hope to enter into theatrical history. The same is true of the collective of builders of the communist future. This, too, must be composed of talented, diverse individuals, each with his own distinct personality, if it is to immortalise its name in the history of human society.

Lenin himself made this point many times.

Our theatre is currently staging the play *Reading Again . . .*, dedicated to the 110th anniversary of the birth of Lenin, which was commemorated in 1980. Among the various excerpts from plays about Lenin, there is one scene in which, on the eve of the Third Congress of the Komsomol, Lenin meets Alexandra Sapozhnikova, who worked on the Moscow Soviet and who, being young and poorly educated, adopted a bureaucratic attitude to people. In her opinion, there were far too many problems to deal with, without concerning oneself about the unfair requisitioning of a mare from a peasant, even if he could subsequently die of hunger because of that. Lenin said, "But surely the abstract millions are composed of concrete Grechinins (that being the name of the peasant—*Ed.*), of their children who want to eat, drink, live. . . ."

These words were said in 1920, during the Civil War, when the So-

viet government was facing enormous problems that touched upon the very survival of the young republic. Nonetheless, Lenin's main concern was for peace, for people, for their future and the future of their children. The Decree on Peace was the first decree issued by the Soviet government. The Brest peace treaty was concluded for the sake of peace. The Soviet government has always striven to find a peaceful solution to all its problems. War is an unnatural phenomenon that contradicts human life and human dignity. As mankind develops, so also should his ability to find a peaceful solution to even the most acute international problems, the most acute social and class conflicts.

The problems which should serve to unite societies with different social systems are far more numerous than those which divide mankind. When we see on our television screens children dying of hunger, lying alongside the bodies of their mothers, when we see thousands of people in different parts of the world who lack schools and books, and who live in squalor and ignorance, we are filled with pity, compassion and indignation. How are such things possible today, in the last quarter of the 20th century!? And we automatically fall to thinking how marvellous it would be if even a part of the money spent on arms were used to cure the sick, feed the hungry and build schools and kindergartens. These are the concerns that should engage the minds and hearts of all civilised people. Sometimes it seems so simple—indeed, it is much simpler than feeding the full or clothing the clothed.

However, when we look at the real world around us, we cannot fail to note that it is today standing on the brink of a nuclear catastrophe, and that we cannot dedicate ourselves exclusively to the problems of peaceful construction. The means of destruction are becoming increasingly dangerous, and the very possibility of war is becoming increasingly horrific.

In such circumstances, the struggle for peace turns into a struggle for the survival of mankind, for the continuation of life on our planet, a planet that is so beautiful, yet so fragile, as fragile and as beautiful as human life itself.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which has done and is doing everything in its power to ensure peace, appeals to all people of goodwill to unite their efforts and actively participate in the struggle for peace throughout the world, in order to prevent a world war that could prove fatal for mankind.

This appeal is also addressed to those of us who work in the the-

atre, and the Soviet theatre is making every effort to promote the noble struggle for peace. Every play we produce should assert the right to live, the right to the happiness of peaceful labour. We must expose the designs of those who, in their blind drive for profit, wealth and power, may at any moment cause irreparable harm. Whatever the conflicts presented on the stage, whatever the difficulties our heroes overcome, all must be subordinate to one idea—"NO" TO WAR!

One very fine Soviet play ends with the words: "Just as long as there isn't another war." The heroine, as any Soviet citizen should it be necessary is ready to take up arms to defend all that is most precious to her—her homeland, her home, her children. She will give away her life if necessary. More than once the Soviet people have proved their strength and staunchness by paying the highest price. The task that faces us today is no less difficult: to defend peace by every available means, to preserve the forces of the people for life, and for the construction of a new, communist society.

Speaking at both the 25th and 26th congresses of the CPSU, Leonid Brezhnev referred to the achievements and successes of Soviet theatrical art. At the same time he also set before us new tasks, connected with the noble educative mission of the theatre. These tasks require years of tranquillity in order to concentrate on creative search.

The art of the theatre is, by its nature, an investigation into man. It differs from many other forms of art in that man, the actor, is also the artistic material. Only in times of peace is it possible to devote all the resources of the theatre to a profound and comprehensive study of human behaviour and the human soul. Only in times of peace can we solve the ever more complex problems involved in creating harmonious theatrical productions.

As far back as 1919, Maxim Gorky spoke about his conversation with Lenin on the theatre. "That the new theatre-going public is no worse than the old, that it is even more attentive, is beyond dispute. But what does it need? I say that all it needs is the heroic, but Vladimir Ilyich says that it also needs lyricism, that it needs Chekhov, the truth about ordinary life." In the difficult years of the Civil War, Lenin was thinking about years of peace for Soviet people, and, with prevision typical of him, spoke about the wide range of theatrical possibilities, the diverse methods that can be used to influence people living in times of peace.

When war breaks out, people say: "It won't last long. It's too

stupid." War is indeed stupid, but this does not prevent it from continuing. The words to this effect spoken by Albert Camus, express the attitude of a humanist writer to war, an attitude independent of his social position. Philosophers of the past, who penetrated much more deeply than Camus into the causes of war, were almost all convinced that war is not an inevitability for civilised man. However, among the various schools of philosophy there is also that of Nietzsche, which is quite rightly considered a pro-fascist ideology: it preaches force, war, as a means by which the strong can conquer the weak. There are too many people, they must be destroyed from time to time, and this is best done by war. The "elite", on the other hand, are to enjoy all the pleasures of life, the works of the great artists and composers; these works are immortal.

One might suppose that the proponents of such a theory would also have supported the American neutron bomb, which destroys life but spares material values, works of art and architectural monuments. This is, in fact, fascism in a more refined form—destroy all that lives, including the artists and craftsmen who could have created new works of art. It is assumed that the "elite", the "supermen", will survive in order to enjoy great works of art on behalf of the rest of mankind. This is the cold calculation of neo-fascist philosophers and murderers. What scorn for those whose labour and talent has created all that surrounds us on earth, all that is capable of giving happiness. It is appropriate here to recall the words of Engels that only labour has "given the human hand the high degree of perfection required to conjure into being the pictures of a Raphael, the statues of a Thorwaldsen, the music of a Paganini."

We, Soviet citizens, educated in Marxist esthetics and brought up in the best traditions of Russian and world literary classics, cannot think of art apart from human perception. To deprive works of art of the possibility of being seen or heard is to condemn them to death. It is vandalism, perfected by the blind hatred of those who would unleash a new destructive war. There is no hope in this kingdom of death for those who work in the theatre, for dramatic art is created by people and viewed by people. Dramatic art lives while mankind exists, and therefore we will fight for peace and disarmament with every means at our disposal. Our struggle for peace is not only a struggle for life, for the means of existence, for the future of our children, but also a struggle to ensure the immortality of our art.

THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE AND DISARMAMENT

YUVENALY (VLADIMIR KIRILLOVICH POYARKOV)

Metropolitan of Krutitsa and Kolomna, b. 1935. Graduated from the Moscow Theological Academy in 1961. Since 1977 he has been Metropolitan of Krutitsa and Kolomna and a permanent member of the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church. From 1978 to 1981 he was the head of the Department for External Church Relations of the Moscow Patriarchate. Metropolitan Yuvenaly is a member of the World Council of Churches, a member of the Soviet Peace Committee and of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation. He is also a board member of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, Vice-President of the USSR-USA Friendship Society, and Deputy Chairman of the Board of the USSR-FRG Friendship Society.

Metropolitan Yuvenaly is the author of theological works and studies on the activities of the Russian Orthodox Church.

“Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men” (Luke, 2, 14). This hymn of praise marked the beginning of the Christian era on earth. However, the centuries that followed were darkened by thousands of wars and armed conflicts. The reality of this world has proved to be ambivalent. In it we can see the bright reflections of divine beauty, expressed in the rational building of human life, in peaceful, creative activity, in the noble ideals of humanism and universal brotherhood. However, it also displays a darker side, when human life is based on the vicious foundations of egoism and selfishness, rivalry and enmity, when ideals become unattainable or nonexistent. Faced with such profound duality, the religious man, aware of his responsibility for the destiny of the world, cannot be a

passive onlooker, or one who abandons principle in order to reconcile the irreconcilable. He must be an active champion of a rational and just restructuring of life, of the ideals of peace and humanism, of the triumph of good in every sphere of human endeavour and human relations.

The Russian Orthodox Church views its peace-making service as one of the forms of its activity, one that is based on the Biblical teaching on the common origin of all men. "And hath made of one blood all nations of men" (The Acts, 17, 26). For the Christian, therefore, all the peoples of the earth compose one family, one brotherhood of men, and when peace is violated, when one people attacks another, he can only view this as fratricide in the full sense of the word.

In defining the essence of the Church, St. Paul the Apostle described it as a single Body having many members organically linked to each other: "And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it". (I Corinthians 12, 26). These words affirm the organic harmony of all the members, perfect peace, which is the natural state of any healthy organism.

Over the many centuries of its history, the Church has developed and possesses various means of actively promoting the cause of peace. These include, above all, the common prayer of all believers "for peace on earth", which expresses the common desire of all Christians to see the world in peace and harmony; the personal witness of the followers of Christ, who spread the good tidings near and far, fully aware that God created man free and responsible for all that happens upon the earth; and, finally, the pastoral role of the Church of Christ, which directs the efforts of individual peace-makers into one current and towards one goal.

Condemning war as attack and violence, the Church of Christ gives its blessing to the feat of the defence and protection of the victims of attack, basing itself on the words of Christ: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends" (John, 15, 13).

In the periods of grim trials for our state, the Russian Orthodox Church stood alongside its people, blessing and encouraging them in their sacred struggle against foreign invaders.

Having experienced, together with its people, all the horrors of

world war, and made its own worthy contribution to the national heroic effort, the Russian Church could not remain indifferent when new signs of tension began to appear in international relations.

In July 1948, when there appeared ominous signs of preparations for a new, even more destructive war, the Russian Orthodox Church, together with other Churches participating in the Conference of Heads and Representatives of Local Orthodox Churches, held to mark the 500th anniversary of the autocephaly of the Russian Orthodox Church, called on all Christians and all men who seek peace and truth "to be the shield against any attempt and any action designed to violate peace, and to render impotent any intent and design aimed at a new military conflagration".

The Russian Orthodox Church has always dedicated and continued to dedicate its labour and efforts to the struggle to ensure the triumph of love and peace, seeing peace-making as its vocation. In dedicating all its efforts to the cause of reconciliation of men, the Russian Orthodox Church continually prays to God for the gift of peace to the whole world and fosters the ideas of peace in those who study in its theological educational establishments and in all those to whom it preaches the Gospel of Christ, the Gospel of love and peace.

Information about the contribution of the Russian Orthodox Church to the cause of peace on earth and friendship among the peoples of the world is published regularly in the Church press. In 1949 a section entitled 'Peace Movement' was introduced into *The Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate* publishing sermons, official documents, reports, speeches and articles dealing with the problems of international peace. The collection *Theological Studies* publishes works devoted to theological problems of peace-making. The Church press helps to disseminate the theory and practice of peace-making, inspiring the clergy to work to secure international peace and consolidate the unity of religious peace champions.

The Russian Orthodox Church actively participates in the activity of the Soviet Peace Fund, and the value of its contribution is attested to, among other things, by the many Peace Fund awards to representatives of the numerous dioceses of our Church.

The Russian Orthodox Church at once joined in the work of international and national organisations established with the aim of preventing a new war, convinced that neither differences of belief, nor

lack of belief on the part of many people of goodwill, should stand in the way of joint efforts on behalf of the human community at the local, national or international level.

Patriarch Alexyi and other hierarchs of the Russian Orthodox Church gave their full support to the idea of convening a World Congress of Peace Forces, put forward in 1949. Addressing its delegates, the representative of the Moscow Patriarchate, Metropolitan Nikolai of Krutitsa and Kolomna, said: "The Russian Orthodox Church joins its voice wholeheartedly to this demonstration of the desire for peace and prays for the success of this undertaking."

In October 1949, Patriarch Alexyi addressed a special peace-making Message to his entire flock to mark international peace day. This Message was read out in every Orthodox church after the prayer for peace throughout the world. At the beginning of 1950, Patriarch Alexyi sent the following message to the representatives of all Orthodox autocephalous churches: "The time has come for us, the shepherds of the flock of Christ, to declare openly for all to hear that international issues should no longer be settled by the slaughter of millions of people." That same year, Patriarch Alexyi called upon all archpriests, priests and the faithful children of the Russian Orthodox Church to sign the Stockholm Appeal for peace.

In 1952, on the initiative of the Russian Orthodox Church, a Conference of the Churches and Religious Associations in the USSR in Defence of Peace was held in Zagorsk with a view to intensifying their efforts to secure peace throughout the world. The Conference sent messages to all Churches and religious associations, to the clergy and faithful of all the religions of the world, calling upon them to unite with their peoples in the struggle for peace and oblige their governments to abandon the disastrous policy of unleashing a new world war.

The Moscow Patriarchate began to take an active part in the work of international Christian organisations and movements in defence of peace, as soon as they emerged.

The year 1957 saw the foundation of the Christian Peace Conference (CPC). This was a time of division, the period of the cold war, and therefore the churches' task consisted in revealing the possibility of co-operation, and in showing that, at a time of numerous divisions, such co-operation is service to the cause of peace and, at the same time, service to Christ. The first Christian Peace Conference, at which the Russian Orthodox Church was also represented, described the idea

of an atomic war and preparation for such a war as "rebellion against God and an attempt on the life of mankind, for whom Jesus Christ died and rose from the dead".

In June 1961, the First All-Christian Peace Congress was held in Prague, attended by a delegation from the Russian Orthodox Church. Words from the Gospel "...and on earth peace" (Luke 2, 14) were chosen as the theme. It was also at that time that a Consultative and a Working Committee, which included representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church, were set up to continue the work of the Christian peace movement. Five All-Christian Peace Congresses have been held since then (the last in June 1978, in Prague), and representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church have taken an active part in them and in other undertakings launched by the CPC.

In July 1969, the Second Conference of Representatives of All the Religions of the USSR for Co-operation and Peace Among Nations took place in the Trinity-St. Sergius Monastery. The aim of the Conference was defined in the Appeal by those taking part in the Conference to believers throughout the world and to all men of goodwill: "We, Christians and Buddhists, Muslims and Jews, have been brought here by our awareness as believers of the duty laid upon us by our faiths, which call upon us to pursue the path of peace and justice, to come out against the violation of love and truth in the life of mankind, to safeguard the peaceful life of nations and promote co-operation among them in the name of universal progress." The Conference discussed such questions as "Peaceful Coexistence and the Revolutionary Transformation of the World", "Nuclear Disarmament", "The Problems of the Developing Countries in Their Attitude to Justice and Peace Among the Nations" and "The Individual in Contemporary Socio-Political Structures". At the end of the Conference the participants appealed to all believers and all people of goodwill to increase their contribution to the sacred struggle to secure just and lasting peace and co-operation among all nations.

In 1961, the Russian Orthodox Church joined the World Council of Churches (WCC), where its representatives, participating in the work of WCC assemblies and conferences and in the activities of its standing bodies, are doing all in their power to ensure that the WCC serves effectively to the cause of peace on earth. In February 1964, the Executive Committee of the WCC met in Odessa and adopted a special document: "Problems and Possibilities of Disarmament

at the Present Time", which welcomed the Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water, and called upon the great powers to co-operate on disarmament. The Russian Orthodox Church attaches particular importance to the activity of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs and to the implementation of its programmes against militarism, the arms race and for disarmament.

The Russian Orthodox Church is pursuing the same aim in the Conference of European Churches (CEC), a regional religious organisation which was founded in 1959 and which has set as one of its tasks the strengthening of peace in Europe. A special working group, "The Creation of Peace in Europe" has been set up within the CEC and is now operating successfully. In October 1979, the VIII General Assembly of CEC was held on the Island of Crete. The motto of the assembly was "Serving the World—in the Power of the Holy Spirit". In his Message to mark the opening of the Assembly, Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and All Russia wrote:

"Europe with its problems and anxieties, should be the object of constant attention for the Christians of this continent. We mark with satisfaction and gratitude the fruitful role played by the CEC in support of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference and the resulting relaxation of tension in Europe and throughout the world. We are well aware how extremely important the problem of mutual trust is for the consolidation of detente in Europe. It is precisely in establishing mutual trust that our Churches' reconciling role may be revealed. Trust is also necessary as an ethical basis for disarmament, without which detente is inconceivable. Therefore our Churches, proclaiming God's Commandment *Thou shalt do no murder* (Matthew 19,18), should be particularly sensitive to the continual piling up of weapons, to the development of militaristic tendencies, to the false promises that security may be guaranteed from positions of strength based on weapons capable of destroying all things living."

Thus, as a member of the WCC, the CEC and the CPC, the Russian Orthodox Church is working indefatigably to strengthen its ties with the Christians of other countries and continents, and to find a solution to the main problems facing the modern world, among which the most important is that of achieving a stable international peace and universal and complete disarmament.

One of the major peace-making initiatives undertaken by the Rus-

sian Orthodox Church was the convocation in Moscow, in June 1977, of a World Conference "Religious Workers for Lasting Peace, Disarmament and Just Relations Among Nations". The delegates to the Conference declared: "The dignity of man demands the assurance of opportunity for all to work and for all to live a life worthy of men, for the comprehensive development and perfection of human person and society. The religions of the world have to contribute by their spirituality and ethical influence to the emergence of a peaceful and just community of nations in the world."¹ The Conference called upon the religious leaders and believers of all the religions of the world to join their efforts in the struggle for peace, disarmament and the building of just relations among the nations. The Conference also adopted an Appeal to the Governments of All Countries of the World which declared: "The use of nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction is contrary to all moral law. No situation can justify their use. We appeal to you, both those governments now possessing a nuclear arsenal and those who do not, to agree together not to use them, and to find a way of progressively disarming yourselves of those inhuman instruments of mutual destruction. . .

"We welcome international detente as a necessary condition for building a just and peaceful world. We appeal to all nations to make detente extend to the whole world, to follow up political detente with military and economic detente, and to ensure that detente is irreversible."²

The Conference and the results of its work evoked a broad response throughout the world, and provided yet further proof of the fact that all religions are dedicated to the ideals of peace, justice and brotherhood. The similarity in the ethical principles of different religions, despite their doctrinal differences, makes it possible for believers to unite together for fruitful co-operation to the benefit of all mankind. Those who live in accord with the spirit of their faith are united in the universal desire to eliminate the threat of war.

During the last few years, certain political figures in the West have attempted to revive the cold war. Such moves arouse concern among all people of goodwill, and make it all the more important that the

¹ Appeal to Religious Leaders and Believers of All Religions Throughout the World, *The Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate*, No. 8, 1977, p. 19.

² Ibid., p. 22.

Christian Churches of the USSR and the USA work together for peace. Following the Divine command to each Christian to be a peace-maker and to strive for peace, the Churches of the USSR and the USA have frequently combined their efforts to promote peace upon earth.

In March 1979, delegations of prominent church leaders from the USSR and the USA met in Geneva to discuss the joint responsibility of the Churches of their respective countries for disarmament. This consultation took place amidst deep concern over the escalation of the arms race. In the course of the meeting the delegates adopted a joint document entitled "Choose Life", indicating the theological and biblical basis of the involvement of the Churches in the struggle for peace. The delegates expressed their firm conviction that "the arms race cannot be won; it can only be lost... Nor can the cost be measured in money alone. The gifts of God ... are everywhere diverted to the destruction of peace and order... Widespread moral devastation, cynicism and hopelessness are the only rewards...".¹ The delegates elaborated a series of concrete measures to be taken in the struggle for detente and disarmament, and in conclusion appealed to all their brothers and sisters: "Only twenty years separate us from the moment when we will be called upon to mark prayerfully the bimillenary of the coming to the world of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace. How shall we meet that day? In what state shall we present our planet to the Creator; shall it be a blooming garden, or a lifeless, burnt-out devastated land!?"

"Thus the Lord has set before us again life and death, blessing and curse; therefore choose life that you and your descendants may live."²

In August 1980, representatives of the Churches of the USSR and the USA met yet again in Geneva in order to demonstrate once more their inflexible desire to promote international detente. This meeting took place under the motto "Christ Is Our Peace", and it emphasised: "He is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us" (Ephesians 2, 14). Those taking part in the meeting called upon their governments to come to the Madrid conference on security and co-operation in Europe "...with

¹ *The Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate*, No. 6, 1979, pp. 35-37.

² *Ibid.*

renewed and balanced commitment . . . in order that detente and the Helsinki Final Act may win wider credibility and solidarity”.

In October 1980, the IV Conversations between representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church and the international Catholic organisation Pax Christi took place in Zagorsk. The main theme of the consultation was “Detente and Disarmament. Challenge to the Churches”. Those taking part discussed the theological foundations of peace, detente and disarmament, seeing in the mystery of the unity of the Holy Trinity an insistent call for men to unite in brotherhood. They declared that peace is not simply the absence of war, “but that peace on earth, arising from love of one’s neighbour and reconciliation, is the image and the result of the peace of Christ who proceeds from God the Father” (Ephesians 2, 14) and considered it their urgent duty to support efforts to stop the development testing and stockpiling of all types of nuclear weapons, expressing their serious concern at the threat of the so-called limited use of nuclear weapons, which increases the risk of a nuclear catastrophe. The participants in the Conversations were also unanimous in expressing their willingness to give every possible support to such efforts in the years ahead.

The Russian Orthodox Church attaches great importance to its collaboration with the world movement for peace which, under the auspices of the World Peace Council, unites representatives of a broad spectrum of the international community. This increases the effectiveness of their activities and makes it possible to exert a beneficial influence upon the development of international relations. In September 1980, the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace met in Sofia on the initiative of the World Peace Council. Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and All Russia, addressed the parliament, and Metropolitan Filaret of Kiev and Galich, spoke on behalf of the Christian Peace Conference. As a member of the delegation representing the Moscow Patriarchate, I also addressed a meeting of the Commission on European Security and Co-operation.

In his speech delivered to the parliament, Patriarch Pimen declared that the arms race threatened to turn the entire world into a military camp and shattered human hopes and aspirations for justice and peace. “The call of the ancient prophet to beat . . . swords into ploughshares and . . . spears into pruning hooks sounds today like a tocsin throughout the earth, calling all who love peace to work more selflessly, more indefatigably, and more closely together in order to

draw nearer the time when 'nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more' (Isaiah 2, 4)."¹

The work of the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace ended with the adoption of an appeal to all political figures and statesmen, governments and peoples, and also of a charter setting forth the main tasks facing peace champions at the present stage.

Representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church also take part in the international movement for European security and co-operation, and attended the European forums held in De Haan in October 1979, and in Brussels in October 1980. Such meetings have gained in importance over recent years as a result of the fact that world public opinion on the problems of war and peace has become a significant factor in international politics.

In October 1980, a theological consultation of the Asian Christian Peace Conference on the theme "Co-operation with Living Religions towards Peace with Justice" was held in Colombo, Shri Lanka, attended by representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church.

In March 1981, Patriarch Pimen attended a plenum of the Soviet Peace Committee at which he delivered a speech.

In March-April 1981, the Working Committee of the Christian Peace Conference met in Kiev to discuss Christian peace-making efforts in the light of the present international situation. A group of participants in the meeting were received in the Kremlin, where they handed a message from the Christian Peace Conference to the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR Leonid Brezhnev.

The heads and representatives of Churches and religious associations in the USSR, who met together on June 1, 1981, at the Trinity-St. Sergius Monastery in Zagorsk on the invitation of Patriarch Pimen, gave their unanimous support to the peace initiatives of the Soviet government and addressed an appeal to religious people in every country to consolidate peace upon earth. "We appeal to the leaders and followers of all religions in the world to step up their efforts for disarmament and relaxation of tension in the military field. It is the duty of every believer to contribute to these efforts.

"Working to build a radiant edifice of peace, so that confrontation would be consigned to oblivion, and educating people in the principles of peace as the predominant moral factor—this is a major task which

¹ *The Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate*, No. 12, 1980, p. 42.

faces now all Churches and religious associations. This task is in accordance with the spiritual and ethical principles of our religions, which unite us in our common effort to build peace with justice and truth.”¹

On July 9, 1981, Patriarch Pimen spoke in support of the Appeal of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR to the Parliaments and Peoples of the World, and expressed his satisfaction at the fact that numerous churches and religious associations in many countries throughout the world were involved in the peace movement. “We welcome the plurality of peace initiatives by religious circles, which complement one another and together form a great force capable, we believe, of setting up, in conjunction with similar efforts by all men of goodwill, an insurmountable barrier to the destructive triumph of militarism, to the impious madness of those who are longing to dominate the world.

“We believe in the success of men of goodwill on this blessed path which will be attained by the strength of their spirit, their continuous, creative and increasing efforts. For the sake of this success we should all understand realistically the actual situation, the complexity of the danger threatening humanity, and be clearly and optimistically conscious of the ways and means capable of overcoming it. Following this line, I believe it would be timely to hold a world conference of leaders and the prominent workers of world religions on the preservation of life from nuclear destruction. We shall be happy to host this forum.”²

This appeal by the Patriarch evoked a wide response in religious circles throughout the world. At the beginning of October 1981, prominent religious figures from 30 countries met in Moscow and expressed their support for this initiative. The conference was held in Moscow on May 10, 1982. No doubt, this major peace initiative will contribute to the cause of peace throughout the world.

In its efforts to establish peace and justice on earth, the Russian Orthodox Church is pursuing a clear objective. All the faithful of our Church are aware of their responsibility for the fate of world peace and will continue to “follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another” (Romans 14, 19).

¹ *The Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate*, No. 8, 1981, p. 3.

² *The Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate*, No. 9, 1981, p. 2.

THE MUSLIMS OF THE USSR IN SUPPORT OF PEACE AND DISARMAMENT

ZIYAUTDINKHAN IBN ISHAN BABAKHAN

Mufti, b. 1908, has a higher theological education, was an imam and khatyb of a number of mosques in Uzbekistan, and also the Deputy Chairman of the Muslim Board for Central Asia and Kazakhstan. In 1956 he became a mufti and the Chairman of the Muslim Board for Central Asia and Kazakhstan. Mufti Ziyautdinkhan ibn Ishan Babakhan is a member of the Soviet Peace Committee, a member of the Presidium of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, a board member of the Soviet Peace Fund, and a member of the World Peace Council.

Ziyautdinkhan ibn Ishan Babakhan is the author of the book *Islam and the Muslims in the Land of Soviets* brought out in 1980 by the Progress Publishers in Arabic and English. He has also written a number of works on the history of Islam and the Muslim peoples, and articles on the role and place of religions in the struggle for peace and friendship among the nations.

Islam, as all other religions, vigorously condemns the shedding of innocent blood; service to the cause of peace and the establishment of humane relations among peoples is one of its fundamental principles. The Holy Koran declares: "Work not confusion in the earth after the fair ordering (thereof), and call on Him in fear and hope" (Sura VII, ayat 56). Peace and tranquillity are the cherished hope of all believers and the goal to which they direct their moral efforts. The Muslims of the Soviet Union see the struggle to maintain lasting peace on earth as their religious and civic duty, call for evil forces to be held in check and the foundations of peace to be secured.

The cause of friendship and mutual understanding among the peoples of the world is promoted by the efforts of the Muslim organisa-

tions of the Soviet Union to expand and strengthen fraternal ties with fellow Muslims in other countries. The Muslim Board for Central Asia and Kazakhstan, for example, is in close contact with Muslim organisations in more than 80 countries throughout the world, with whom it maintains a regular correspondence and exchanges publications.

Our religious publications are now read in the Arab countries and Asia, in countries of Africa and the Far East, and by Muslims living in America and Europe. In turn, we regularly receive religious literature, newspapers and magazines from Muslim countries.

Muslim organisations in the USSR exchange visits by delegations with Muslim organisations in Asia, Africa, Europe, and America. Dozens of Muslim delegations from all over the world visit the Soviet Union every year, travelling around the country, visiting towns and villages, going to mosques and to enterprises where Muslims are employed, calling to see Muslims in their homes and addressing Muslim congregations. In their turn Muslims of the Soviet Union frequently send representatives on return visits abroad in order to learn about the way of life, hopes and problems of their brothers in faith in other countries.

It is with great satisfaction that we note that many of our foreign colleagues have begun to interpret the fundamental principles of Islam more constructively. They now show a greater willingness to respond to our invitations and to co-operate with us to the benefit of Islam, Muslims and the whole of mankind, thus demonstrating that the cause of peace on earth is dear to all men of goodwill, including Muslims.

The Muslims of the Soviet Union now regularly hold conferences and meetings attended by foreign guests. On such occasions they constantly emphasise their firm resolve to struggle for justice and a lasting peace throughout the world. International conferences are often held on the initiative of Muslim organisations of the USSR to discuss the various problems facing the Muslim world and to express solidarity with peoples fighting against aggression and injustice.

In October 1970 and November 1973, Islamic conferences were held in Tashkent, attended by prominent Muslim leaders from more than 30 countries. These conferences were convened to express the solidarity of the Muslims of the USSR with the Arab peoples struggling against imperialism, Zionism and neo-colonialism and working for a stable and just peace in the Middle East. Participants in the conferences

expressed the firm will of the Muslims of our country to strengthen the ties of friendship and solidarity among peoples, support the just struggle of the Arab peoples against Israeli aggression in the Middle East and work for a lasting peace in this region and throughout the world. A number of appeals was adopted, resolutely condemning the aggressive imperialist policy which sows discord among the peoples of this region. "We, the Muslims of the Soviet Union, . . . proceeding out of our spiritual responsibility, firmly demand that a lasting and just peace be established in the Middle East,"¹ reads the Proclamation to All Muslims and People of Goodwill adopted at the 1973 conference.

The desire of the Muslims of the Soviet Union for a stable peace on earth is so closely bound up with their daily activity that even Muslim forums devoted solely to theological problems always touch upon the problems of securing peace and ending the arms race.

These questions were discussed at the 1974 conference held in Samarkand to mark the 1200th anniversary of the birth of the great theologian Imam Mohammed ibn Ismail al-Bukhari, and attended by prominent theologians from 25 countries. They were also discussed at the international Islamic conferences held in Tashkent to mark the 30th anniversary of the Muslim Board for Central Asia and Kazakhstan (October 1976), and the 10th anniversary of the magazine *Muslims of the Soviet East*, the official organ of the Board (June 1979). The problems of war and peace were also discussed at the international Islamic symposium convened in September 1979 in Dushanbe to prepare to mark the 15th century of the Hegira (the Muslim calendar) and conducted under the motto "The Contribution of the Muslims of Central Asia, the Caucasus and the Volga Region to the Development of Islamic Thought".

A major event for the Muslims of the Soviet Union was the Islamic conference in Tashkent in September 1980. The motto of the conference was "The 15th Century of the Hegira Must Become a Century of Peace and Friendship Among Nations". This conference was attended by over 300 representatives of the Muslim clergy from Central Asia and Kazakhstan, the Volga region, the Caucasus and Siberia, and also by well-known religious figures from more than 30 countries and many international religious organisations.

Those attending the conference noted that there had been a sharpen-

¹ *Muslims of the Soviet East*, No. 4, 1396 (1976), Tashkent, p. 15.

ing of the struggle between the forces coming out for peace, respect for the rights of nations and a relaxation of international tension on the one hand, and the forces of oppression, militarism and aggression on the other. It was emphasised that each Muslim is obliged, proceeding from the peace-making principles of Islam, to intensify his efforts to secure the unity and solidarity of Muslims in the struggle for a just peace on earth and against American imperialism, Zionism and all the enemies of peace and friendship among the nations. Repeated appeals were made to Muslims to expand their co-operation with all the peace-loving forces of the planet in the struggle to secure a lasting peace on earth.

"The present-day international situation," says the Appeal to All Muslims of the World adopted at the conference, "makes the unification of Muslims with all peace-loving forces in the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, Zionism and racism more imperative than ever before. Only in this way will it be possible to defeat the forces of the evil and turn the 15th century of the Hegira into a century of peace and friendship among nations. We are confident that the great cause of peace, friendship and co-operation among nations will be all the more powerful and strong, the more rallied around it will be all the people of goodwill, regardless of their political views, race, nationality and religion."

The conference carefully analysed the development of international events in the light of the wise propositions of the Holy Koran, and showed the determination of the Muslim peoples to step up the struggle for a lasting peace and mutual understanding among the nations.

Islam does not forbid Muslims to co-operate with people of other religions and other world outlooks in a humane and benevolent cause. The Holy Koran says: "Help ye one another unto righteousness and pious duty. Help not one another unto sin and transgression" (Sura V, ayat 2). And it has become a tradition in our multinational country for all religions to co-operate in the name of peace. The Muslim organisations of the Soviet Union have taken an active part in inter-religious conferences devoted to this noble cause, and our experience has been blessed by prominent religious leaders throughout the world. It has shown that such meetings are extremely helpful in uniting the peace-making efforts of representatives of different religions. The common desire for inter-religious co-operation led to the

World Inter-religious Conference in Moscow in June 1977, which took place under the motto "Religious Workers for Lasting Peace, Disarmament and Just Relations Among Nations". Around 700 prominent representatives of different religions from 107 countries gathered in Moscow in order to discuss international problems in a spirit of brotherhood and co-operation and make their contribution to the preservation of peace and detente, to the ending of the pernicious arms race and the establishment of just relations among the nations. The main report was delivered by the present author. Those attending the conference were unanimous in the opinion that all religions call for peaceful coexistence, total and comprehensive disarmament and for ensuring a life of peace and creativity for all mankind.

It is precisely because Islam not only does not prohibit, but on the contrary, urges us to co-operate with all people of goodwill that we, Muslim leaders, take an active part in the peace movement. Muslims of the Soviet Union have taken part in every major undertaking initiated by this movement. Many of my colleagues have been elected to regional and republican peace committees, and I myself have been entrusted with the task of representing the Muslims of the USSR on the Soviet Peace Committee and the World Peace Council.

We, who head Muslim Boards of our country, together with many other Muslim leaders, have frequently travelled abroad to attend numerous international forums and there express the opinions of the Muslims of the USSR and their solidarity with peace-loving peoples in the struggle to preserve peace and tranquillity on earth.

The meeting of the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace, which took place in Sofia in September 1980, was a major event in the history of the peace movement. The Deputy Chairman of the Muslim Board for Central Asia and Kazakhstan, Sheik Yusuf khan Shakirov, who represented the Muslims of the USSR, declared in a speech delivered to the Parliament that the Muslims of the USSR, inspired by the peace-loving and humane teaching of Islam, had always come out and would continue to come out for peace on earth, for peaceful and constructive co-operation among people of different faiths and world outlooks, regardless of colour, language or social system.

The struggle to end the arms race and achieve disarmament is one of the most important aspects of the peace effort. We, Muslims, are

deeply committed to the cause of preserving the conditions created by the Most High for the comprehensive development of life on earth, and it is this that impels us to seek to prevent the mass destruction of human life.

The forces of international reaction, above all the USA, are building up their military potential in Europe, establishing new military bases in different parts of the world and increasing their military presence in the Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf, the Red Sea and the Mediterranean, and, by what right is not clear, declare these areas to be spheres of their "vital interests". The arms race has today assumed an unprecedented scale. The stockpiling of lethal weapons continues, and this constitutes a most serious threat to peace throughout the world. Imperialist propaganda is attempting to persuade the peoples of the world that the neutron bomb is a "clean" bomb as it destroys only people, leaving buildings and monuments intact. Nothing could be more blasphemous or perfidious than such declarations!

We, the Muslims of the USSR, cannot remain indifferent to the fact that every living being upon earth is faced with the threat of destruction. Scientists predict that the consequences of a thermonuclear war will be such as to be beyond comparison with any other war. There would be no front and rear in such a war, and therefore the preservation of peace is a matter that concerns everyone without exception.

The Muslims of the Soviet Union believe that the co-ordinated efforts of all peace-loving forces, of all people of goodwill, regardless of race, nationality or religion, can block the road to such inhuman plans and prevent the outbreak of a new world conflagration which, given the present level of military technology, would be catastrophic for the whole of mankind.

True followers of Islam cannot refuse their support to those forces in the world that oppose the threat of war and champion the restructuring of social relations in accord with the principles of peace and friendship, the principles of social justice and the rejection of oppression.

In October 1981, at a meeting of prominent religious leaders in Moscow, representatives of the Muslims of the Soviet Union expressed their support for the suggestion by the Patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church that a world conference under the motto "Religious

Workers for Saving the Sacred Gift of Life from Nuclear Catastrophe” be held in Moscow in May 1982. Prophet Mohammed teaches us that religious and ideological differences should not lead to war, and that people of different creeds and different world outlooks should live together in peace. The Muslims of the Soviet Union are faithful to these great behests.

We, the Muslims of the Soviet Union, look with optimism to the future, convinced that the united efforts of the peoples of the world will succeed in averting a nuclear catastrophe, halting the arms race and securing peace. The Muslims of the Soviet Union will spare no effort in pursuit of this noble aim.

REVIEWS

**Soviet Public Organisations in the Struggle
for Peace and Disarmament**

Association of Soviet Lawyers

Soviet United Nations Association

**The Committee of Youth
Organisations of the USSR**

The Soviet Women's Committee

**Scientific Research Council
on Peace and Disarmament**

Soviet Trade Unions

The Soviet Committee of War Veterans

**The Soviet Committee for European Security
and Co-operation**

The Soviet Peace Committee

**The Soviet Committee for Solidarity with
Asian and African Countries**

The Soviet Pugwash Committee

The Soviet Peace Fund

**The Union of Soviet Societies
for Friendship and
Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries**

INTRODUCTION

In keeping with Article 28 of the Constitution of the USSR the country's foreign policy is aimed at achieving general and complete disarmament and securing the principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. Numerous public organisations are involved in carrying out these tasks.

Various committees, unions, associations and other public organisations are engaged in large-scale activities to popularise and translate into reality the ideas of peace, international co-operation and disarmament. These organisations with different fields of interest consider helping the struggle against war and for lasting world peace their major goal.

The Soviet public spares no effort to promote the Peace Programme for the Eighties adopted by the 26th Congress of the CPSU, which incorporates a set of initiatives and proposals to curb the arms race and achieve disarmament, to avert and settle international conflicts, and to maintain and consolidate international detente.

Millions of people representing all strata of the multinational Soviet society take part in the activities of these organisations on a voluntary basis. This includes workers and farmers, young people, Communists and non-partisans, scientists, trade unionists, war veterans, the intelligentsia and clergy.

The forms and methods used are varied: mass meetings and demonstrations; collection of signatures to peace appeals; news bulletins and magazines; books and booklets on peace and disarmament; seminars, talks and scientific conferences; sponsoring and cosponsoring of

international assemblies and public forums, and participation in press conferences and in radio and television broadcasts.

The activities of Soviet public organisations are financed from public funds, specifically by the Soviet Peace Fund.

The contents, nature and basic objective of these organisations' activities, their specifics are governed by their respective constitutions and like instruments.

Soviet public organisations take an active part in the world peace movement and in various world-wide public campaigns against militarism and the arms race, and in international conferences for detente and disarmament. Their activities and co-operation with peace movements abroad contribute significantly to the fight for world peace.

In the aggravated international situation of today Soviet public organisations hold that it is of prime importance to extend the dialogue and interaction with various political and social forces in preventing war and maintaining peace. An example of such co-operation is the 1980 World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace in Sofia, and other international meetings and conferences.

The material in this book covers the activity of Soviet public organisations in 1980 and 1981, and vividly illustrates how much is being done by them to further disarmament and rule out war in a joint effort with all peace-loving forces throughout the world.

ASSOCIATION OF SOVIET LAWYERS (ASL) /

ALEXANDER SUKHAREV, Dr. Sc. (Law)

Lawyer, b. 1923, finished the Moscow Institute of Lawyers (1950). Took part in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-45. Since 1970 has been First Deputy Minister of Justice of the USSR. Chairman of the USSR-Democratic Yemen Friendship Society, member of the Soviet Peace Committee, Vice-President of the Association of Soviet Lawyers, and member of the Council of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers.

The Association was founded in 1964. Its predecessor was the section of law (established in 1926) in the framework of VOKS (All-Union Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries), later reorganised into the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries. Members of the Association are professional lawyers. Its aim is to promote confidence, mutual understanding, friendship and co-operation between Soviet and foreign lawyers. The ASL is a collective member of the IADL and the IFWL. It maintains contacts with lawyers in more than 70 countries.

In March 1981, the ASL held its fourth regular conference which summed up its activities in the previous five years and elected a new Board (over 130 members). L. N. Smirnov, Chairman of the USSR Supreme Court, was again elected its President.

The Association participates in various functions designed to ensure international security, peace and disarmament. Its members have taken part in many international meetings on these problems, specifically, sessions of the International Committee on Security and Co-operation in Europe (Brussels), the International Colloquium on International Co-

operation and Disarmament (Helsinki, 1978), the European Forum for Disarmament and Security (De Haan, Belgium, 1979), and the International Conference of Lawyers on European Disarmament (Brussels, 1980).

The ASL participates in actions of the IADL for the use of international law in the interests of strengthening peace and the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. For instance, in pursuance of an IADL decision, the ASL organised a meeting of lawyers from over 30 countries in Moscow in 1977 on "Law, International Co-operation and Detente". Soviet lawyers took an active part in the following IADL-sponsored actions: a symposium on the legal aspects of disarmament and the banning of nuclear weapons (Helsinki, 1979) and a lawyers' meeting on problems of disarmament and the legal basis for peace and security in Europe (Brussels, February 1980).

The ASL renders effective assistance to the IADL in the latter's efforts to mobilise the world community to fight for peace and disarmament and to co-operate in the interests of world security. The IADL's potentialities in this field are quite extensive, since the role of law in international relations is increasing. Soviet lawyers were among the organisers of the IADL's Eleventh Congress held in Valletta (Malta) in November 1980 under the motto "For a New Democratic International Order". The Congress was attended by over 600 lawyers from 74 countries who launched an appeal to the lawyers of the world, declaring their resolute intention to help the struggle of the peoples for peace and social progress, for their right to national independence and free choice of orientation in a world where basic human rights and freedoms are universally observed. Democratic lawyers supported the idea of establishing a new democratic international order in a setting of detente, disarmament and peace. They proposed to draw up and approve a convention to limit arms sales.

In June 1981 Moscow hosted an International Conference of Lawyers "Against the Menace of War and for Initiatives in favour of Peace and Detente" chaired by Nobel and Lenin Peace Prize winner Sean MacBride. The Conference sent a message to Chairman Brezhnev and President Reagan expressing concern over the menacing pace of the arms race and the tense international situation. The message emphasised "the moral and legal obligation" of the USA and the USSR to enter into and pursue constructive negotiations which "are possible and necessary and should concern not merely the limitation

of strategic and nuclear weapons in Europe in particular, but also the reduction of the level of conventional armaments both in Europe and in the world as a whole". In his reply Leonid Brezhnev reaffirmed that the Soviet Union was prepared to enter into and pursue negotiations on all urgent problems of peace and security; it was prepared to negotiate at all levels to improve Soviet-American relations, to turn them into an effective factor of a stable, just and democratic system of international relations. Brezhnev expressed confidence that "the lawyers' community will continue to contribute to the cause of guaranteeing the most basic right of all peoples and of every individual—the right to live in peace".

In September 1981 an ASL delegation attended an international conference of lawyers in Mexico sponsored by the IADL and the Mexican centre for the study of the third world countries' economic and social problems. The conference, which discussed "transition to a new international economic and democratic order" in the context of the ongoing struggle for peace and disarmament, was also attended by experts other than lawyers.

The Association devotes much attention to closer contacts with lawyers' organisations in different countries. It maintains particularly stable and varied relations, including regular exchanges of views and experience, with analogous organisations in socialist countries. On its initiative regular consultations were started between representatives of socialist countries' lawyers unions and associations (1977, Moscow; 1978, Berlin; 1980, Budapest; and 1981, Warsaw).

The Association's relations with lawyers from developing nations have expanded visibly. In recent years it has played host to lawyers from India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Mali, Senegal, Ghana, Syria, Jordan, Algeria, Peru and a number of other countries. Soviet lawyers have visited India, Algeria, Tunisia, Iraq, Kenya, Senegal, Venezuela and some other countries.

Contacts with lawyers from capitalist countries also play an important part in the Association's activities. In 1978 a representative ASL delegation was invited by the American Lawyers Association to tour the USA. During the tour the delegation attended several scientific seminars on a broad range of problems: the social, state and political structure of the USSR and the USA; the Soviet and American legal systems; the new Soviet Constitution and legislation; law education; sea, outer and air space law, and legal aspects of Soviet-American

trade. The seminars held in Washington D. C., Houston, San Francisco and New York were attended on the American side by members of the federal and state supreme courts, federal and country courts, professors of law and practising lawyers.

A delegation of the American Lawyers Association led by the then Secretary of Justice G. Bell paid a return visit to the USSR in 1979. It toured Moscow, Tashkent and Leningrad to discuss such vital topics as the role of law in promoting positive Soviet-American relations; the legal aspects of environmental protection; legal protection of mother and child, and measures against international crimes.

All in all, from 1975 to 1980 the Association sent more than sixty delegations to over 30 countries and played host to some 150 delegations from roughly 40 countries.

The ASL conference in March 1981 launched an appeal to IADL members which, specifically, called on them to support the efforts to maintain and consolidate world peace, and "proposals and suggestions related to the major challenge before us—to fulfil the peoples' will for peace".

Soviet lawyers regard human contacts and exchange of opinions, information and ideas as an important factor conducive to mutual confidence and better understanding and friendship among nations. Professional ties, including those between lawyers of different countries, are a component of this process. Soviet lawyers are prepared to keep on making their contribution to the struggle for peace, detente and international co-operation.

SOVIET UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION

VLADIMIR TRUKHANOVSKY

Historian, b. 1914, finished the Teachers' Training Institute in Leningrad (1940) and the Higher Diplomatic School (1941). In 1964 he was elected corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences. From 1941 to 1953 he was on diplomatic work. Held the following posts: head of the department of history, then of the history of international relations and Soviet foreign policy, at the Moscow Institute of International Relations (1947-1953); senior research worker (1953-1957) and Deputy Director (1957-1960) of the Institute of History, USSR Academy of Sciences; since 1960—Editor-in-Chief of the magazine *Voprosi Istorii* (Problems of History). Trukhanovsky is Deputy Chairman of the Soviet UN Association, a member of the Pugwash Council and of the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament.

The Association was founded in 1956 to popularise the aims and principles of the United Nations, to promote world peace and to sustain the aspirations of the peoples for international co-operation, mutual understanding, solidarity and friendship with other nations.

The same year it was admitted as member to the World Federation of UN Associations (WFUNA), a non-governmental organisation with a consultative status, category I, with ECOSOC and category A with UNESCO, co-operating with other UN specialised agencies under pertinent agreements.

The Association is active in the Federation's leading bodies, which make major decisions on WFUNA attitudes to international issues, and in WFUNA actions for a stable peace through disarmament and stronger security through effective implementation of UN resolutions.

The Association pays particular attention to questions of detente and disarmament, and promotes the role of public opinion in achieving the objectives of the Conference on European Security and Co-operation, mutual understanding between nations and the struggle against colonialism, racism and apartheid.

The recent sharp rise in militarism and the attempts of certain elements in the USA and other NATO countries and China to frustrate detente are being countered with new efforts on the part of the Association against the return to confrontation, unbridled arming and the nuclear war threat.

These aims motivated the Association's position at various international functions of the Federation dealing with the urgent problems of maintaining peace and extending international co-operation. For example, the main subject of discussion at the Twenty-Seventh Plenary Assembly of WFUNA in Barcelona (October, 1979) was disarmament and development in the eighties and the tasks of the Federation and national UN associations. The Assembly adopted a number of resolutions with the active support of the Soviet delegation calling on governments to back up confidence-building measures, to reduce military budgets and set a moratorium on the development of new mass destruction weapons.

The seventh regional conference of European UN associations (Cologne, November 1980) attended by the representatives of 20 national associations, including that of the Soviet Union, reviewed problems of security for the eighties, environmental problems, "the quality of life" in Europe, etc. Its resolution on security is imbued with great concern over the continuing arms race; it emphasises that the only acceptable principle is that of peaceful coexistence and co-operation; it also calls for the urgent implementation of the provisions of the CSCE Final Act and for support to all actions within the framework of the United Nations to achieve disarmament.

The Association devoted much attention to the preparations for a WFUNA-initiated conference of non-governmental organisations on the implementation of the Helsinki Final Act. The conference opened in Madrid in November 1980—the same month as the follow-up CSCE meeting. In a unanimously approved message its delegates called on the participants in the Madrid meeting to focus their attention on European security and co-operation and an early disarmament conference in Europe.

The Association's representatives took part in the UN-sponsored NGO disarmament conference in New York (June 1980).

A Soviet delegation participated in the Twenty-Eighth Plenary Assembly of WFUNA in Geneva attended by 45 UN associations, the ISMUN, as well as the United Nations Organisation and a number of its specialised agencies and international non-governmental organisations. The agenda of the Assembly included the following items: security through disarmament and the tasks of WFUNA and national associations in connection with the Second Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament. Participants in the Assembly adopted a declaration on Security Through Disarmament and a Policy Statement on Development and International Economic Co-operation, which emphasised the need for more active efforts to realise the resolutions of the First Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament, and on the inter-relationship between peace, disarmament, detente and international economic co-operation.

Disarmament experts from the Soviet and American UN associations met in Moscow on November 12-14, 1980 to discuss progress in Soviet-US political relations, the prospects of strategic arms limitation, European security and possible solutions of international conflicts. Meetings of this kind, which have become traditional, serve to improve the Association's bilateral contacts.

In March-April 1981 Moscow hosted a seminar on peace and security in Asia and a new international economic order, held between the Soviet UN Association and the Indian UN Federation. Participants from both sides expressed their concern over the aggravated political situation in the world and the emergence of new hotbeds of tension, particularly in Asia, and supported the idea of turning the Indian Ocean into a peace zone.

The Soviet UN Association centred its attention on vital problems of international relations and the struggle for peace and disarmament in its other bilateral contacts. These and other problems related to the preparation of WFUNA actions (including the drafting of agendas) and the strengthening of bilateral relations and co-operation were discussed in 1980 both when Soviet delegations visited Great Britain, the USA, Finland and some other countries and when the Soviet Union hosted delegations from Hungary, the USA, Great Britain, West Germany and other states.

The Association strives to popularise UN activities in the Soviet

Union. Public meetings are organised annually in Moscow, Kiev, Minsk and other large cities to back up important UN actions. The resolutions of such mass meetings, say, on UN Day, Disarmament Week or Human Rights Day, are forwarded to the UN Secretariat.

Another form of activity is adoption of statements on topical international problems. In February 1980 the Association issued a statement on the menace to peace and detente. It called attention to the decision of the NATO session in Brussels (December 1979) to station in Europe US medium-range missiles, to the US refusal to ratify the SALT-2 Treaty and the positions-of-strength foreign policy of the US Administration, i.e. to steps that are likely to cause a new spiral of the arms race. The statement was sent to United Nations headquarters, the WFUNA and the national UN associations.

In a talk with members of the Association Board in Moscow on May 4, 1981 the then UN Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim emphasised that as world tensions had increased the role of the United Nations and the support of its activities by public organisations were acquiring added significance. He lauded the activities of the Soviet UN Association.

THE COMMITTEE OF YOUTH ORGANISATIONS OF THE USSR

VLADIMIR AKSYONOV

B. 1946. Chairman of the Committee of Youth Organisations of the USSR, a deputy of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation and a member of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation. He graduated from the Moscow Physical-Technical Institute in 1969 and has held various posts with the Young Communist League since 1971, becoming Chairman of the CYO in 1980.

The international activity of the Soviet youth organisations and, above all, of the Young Communist League, the Komsomol, their participation in the struggle by the progressive youth of the world for peace and social progress convincingly testify to the internationalist sentiments prevailing among the younger generation in the Soviet Union.

In 1981 the Committee of Youth Organisations celebrated its 25th anniversary. It was set up on July 5, 1956 at a meeting of the representatives of the Soviet youth organisations convened to review the results of the activity of the Anti-fascist Committee of Soviet Youth (ACSY) established in 1941. The ACSY had been highly instrumental in promoting the joint action of the progressive youth of the world in the struggle against fascism. Its activities had conducted to stronger ties with the young people in the countries of the anti-fascist coalition. Since the ACSY had accomplished its tasks it was decided to create on its basis a Committee of Youth Organisations of the USSR (CYO), a public organisation whose activity would be devoted to expanding

and strengthening the Soviet youth's ties with international, regional and national youth and student organisations abroad in order to promote the struggle for peace, security, co-operation and social progress. The CYO incorporates the public, professional, student, cultural, sports and other organisations of the Soviet youth.

Today, the Committee maintains contacts with more than 1,350 youth and student organisations in 140 countries. Special emphasis is laid on the co-operation with such authoritative international youth organisations as the World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY) and the International Union of Students (IUS). The Committee has its representatives in the WFDY Bureau and the Secretariat of the IUS and in their journals, *World Youth* and *World Student News*, published in several languages.

The YCL and the other Soviet youth organisations seek to promote broad international co-operation in such vital areas as the movement for peace, detente, curbing the arms race, disarmament and anti-imperialist solidarity, and for the political, economic and social rights of the younger generation. One example of this is the co-operation with a wide range of youth organisations of different political orientations in the international youth and students' festivals and rallies.

In the seventies, the process of detente appreciably contributed to expanding co-operation among various political forces within the international youth movement in the struggle for peace and security of nations, for the rights of the youth.

The Soviet youth organisations took an active part in such important events as the European Youth and Students Meeting for Lasting Peace, Security, Co-operation and Social Progress (Warsaw, 1976, the International Conference of Youth and Students "To Convert the Indian Ocean into a Zone of Peace, Security and Co-operation" (Madras, 1976), the European Youth and Student Conference on Disarmament (Hungary, 1978), the international meetings "October and Youth" (Leningrad, 1977), "Lenin and Youth" (Moscow, 1980), the World Conference for a Peaceful and Secure Future for All Children (Moscow, 1979), the World Conference of Youth and Students for the Establishment of a New International Economic Order (Oakstepec, Mexico, 1980). For the period of the Moscow Olympic Games (July-August 1980) an International Youth Camp was set up in Moscow.

Under the conditions of the sharp aggravation of the international situation in the late seventies and early eighties the youth's struggle for peace and against arms race, against the deployment of new US medium-range missiles in Western Europe and the US Administration's plans to produce neutron weapons is acquiring increasing importance. The tendency of the international youth movement to rally a wide range of political forces is of paramount importance today.

The establishment of the Framework for All-European Youth and Student Co-operation (FAEYSC) at a constituent assembly held in Budapest in October 1980 signalled a new stage in the European youth movement for peace, detente and disarmament for the basic provisions of the Helsinki accords. The FAEYSC was preceded by a long period of discussions and consultations in which the CYO took an active part. The Framework has provided a mechanism of holding consultations, exchanging opinions, formulating joint recommendations and charting co-ordinated actions. It incorporates 30 international and regional youth and student organisations, including such representative and authoritative youth associations as the WFDY and the IUS, the Council of European National Youth Committees, the International Union of Socialist Youth, and the International Federation of Liberal and Radical Youth.

The establishment of such a system of youth co-operation, unique in many respects, as the FAEYSC created political prerequisites for holding, in January 1981, the World Forum of Youth and Students for Peace, Detente and Disarmament in Helsinki.

The initiative on convening such a forum had been advanced at the 18th YCL Congress in April 1978. As a matter of fact, it was the first event on the world scale in the history of the international youth movement to be devoted to the struggle against nuclear war and the arms race, attended by the representatives of practically all significant political youth forces—the young Communists, Social Democrats, Socialists, Radicals, Liberals, Catholics, Christian Democrats. Youth organisations of various countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America were widely represented. Altogether, the Forum was attended by some 650 delegates of international, regional and national organisations from more than 100 countries.

The Forum was a scene of an animated and not infrequently acute discussion on a wide range of problems. The delegates tackled such vital issues as the contemporary world situation, the political and

military aspects of detente, the social and economic consequences of the arms race, co-operation of youth and students in the struggle for peace, detente and disarmament. During the debates attempts were made to distort the true reasons behind the aggravation of the international situation and to divert the discussion from the burning questions of the world today. However, the overwhelming majority of the participants denounced the militarist plans hatched out by the NATO, and vehemently criticised the advocates of the so-called "limited nuclear war" concept. The Final Document adopted by the Forum recorded the agreement reached by the youth and student organisations of various political orientations to intensify the struggle for peace, detente and disarmament.

In 1980 and 1981 the representatives of the Soviet youth participated in a number of meetings and conferences, among them the 3rd International Student Round-Table Conference on Disarmament (Geneva, September 1980), the 13th Congress of the International Union of Students (Berlin, November 1980), and the International Conference "Youth, Development, Peace" (Baku, September 1981). The latter was attended by the representatives of 45 international and national youth organisations from 38 countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The Soviet youth organisations are multiplying their efforts in the struggle for peace and disarmament, expanding their international ties and contacts and searching for new forms of co-operation with youth organisations of different political orientations on the basis of the struggle for peace and friendship.

THE SOVIET WOMEN'S COMMITTEE

VALENTINA NIKOLAYEVA-TERESHKOVA

Cosmonaut, b. 1937. President of the Soviet Women's Committee. In 1955-1962, after a year as a band-binding operator at the Yaroslavl Tyre Plant, she worked at the Krasnyi Perekop Textile Mill, taking, at the same time, a correspondence course at the Yaroslavl Textile College, which she graduated in 1960. She joined the team of Soviet cosmonauts in 1962 and made a space flight in 1963. A graduate of the Air Force Engineers Academy (1969), she defended her Master thesis in 1976. Since 1968 she has been President of the Soviet Women's Committee. A member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, a deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet and a member of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Valentina Nikolayeva-Tereshkova is also Vice-President of the Women's International Democratic Federation, a member of the World Peace Council and a member of the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament.

The Soviet Women's Committee (SWC) is a public organisation which in its activities relies on the voluntary participation of women—workers, peasants, doctors, teachers, public and state figures, artists and scientists—from all parts of the USSR. Among the members of the Committee are representatives of trade unions, co-operative and youth organisations, and professional associations. The editors-in-chief of the twenty women's magazines published in the Soviet Union are also on the Committee.

The Committee actively participates in the international democratic women's movement in defence of the rights of women and children, for peace, national independence, democracy and social progress, pro-

moting and strengthening friendly ties with women's organisations in other countries.

The SWC was formed in 1941, at the beginning of the Great Patriotic War and was then called the Anti-fascist Committee of Soviet Women. In 1956 it was renamed the Soviet Women's Committee.

During the war the Committee rallied women to fight against fascism and established ties with women's organisations in the countries of the anti-fascist coalition to unite the efforts against the common enemy threatening all mankind.

After the victory was won over German fascism and Japanese militarism, the peoples of the world were confronted with the task of uniting their forces in the struggle for the prevention of a new world war, against the revival of fascism, for the preservation of peace among the peoples, for the life and happiness of children.

The Anti-fascist Committee of Soviet Women was among the initiators of setting up the Women's International Democratic Federation (WIDF) in 1945, which is today the world's most massive and militant international women's organisation. As a national affiliate of the WIDF (at present it unites 129 organisations in 114 countries), the SWC participates in the work of the Federation aimed at uniting women in the struggle for peace, security and co-operation of the peoples, for national independence, for the equality of women and the happiness of children. The SWC has representatives in the WIDF Bureau and Secretariat. Speaking in Moscow in September 1981 on occasion of the 40th anniversary of the Soviet Women's Committee, WIDF President Freda Brown expressed a high opinion of the Soviet women's contribution to the consolidation of co-operation between kindred organisations of different countries.

The Soviet Women's Committee maintains friendly contacts and co-operates with more than 250 national women's organisations of different political trends in 120 countries and also with regional and international women's organisations.

There are regular meetings of the leaders of women's organisations in socialist countries. One of the latest was held in Berlin in July 1981. It devoted much attention to the tasks of the struggle for disarmament and peace in the context of preparations for the World Congress of Women in Prague (October 1981).

An example of bilateral co-operation was the traditional Soviet-American meeting of women "The Role of Public Opinion in Struggle

for World Without Wars" held in Moscow in January 1980. In the course of this meeting representatives of Soviet and American women displayed their unanimous desire to contribute to the development of mass actions against the implementation of the NATO decisions on the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe. They called for the ratification of the SALT-2 Treaty and for the continuation of all talks on the reduction and control of armaments. The next, seventh Soviet-American meeting (Bryn Maw, Pennsylvania, USA, 1981) discussed questions connected with the role of women's organisations in the struggle against the arms race and for disarmament at the present stage.

At the end of 1979, a bilateral Soviet-Japanese meeting, "Women's Role in the Education of the Rising Generation", was held. Its participants emphasised the need of promoting international co-operation among women and pointed out that the education of children in the spirit of peace and respect for other peoples must become an inseparable component of the entire process of education. The participants declared their resolve to fight against the arms race, for general and complete disarmament, for the extension of detente reached in Europe to other continents, including Asia. In the summer of 1981 a Soviet delegation participated in a meeting with Japanese women in Tokyo. The Japanese participants stated that they rejected the policy of militarisation of their country pushed forward under the cover of the hue and cry about the "Soviet military threat" and that they demanded adherence to a policy of goodneighbourliness with the Soviet Union.

In May 1981 the Soviet Women's Committee was visited by a group of women from Britain. They brought a letter which said that young English mothers working actively in many peace organisations would like to establish friendly relations with their coevals in the USSR and the USA. Such trilateral ties could, in their view, help bring down the barrier of distrust and fear on the way to disarmament. Soviet women support the striving for such contacts. We are convinced that these contacts can play a positive role in destroying this barrier that is being created by the interested circles in Western countries.

The SWC delegation participated in September 1981 in the seminar in Helsinki devoted to the struggle of women for peace. Among the participants were women's organisations of the main political parties of Finland and also representatives of the Finnish Peace Committee and trade unions.

In 1980-1981 representatives of the Committee participated in a number of important international forums at which they actively supported detente and disarmament: the meeting of women of European countries, the United States and Canada "Women Against Fascism—For Peace and Disarmament" (May 1980, Warsaw), the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace (September 1980, Sofia), the European Women's Meeting "Women in the Struggle for Peace in Europe" (October 1980, Helsinki), the WIDF international seminar "Women's Role in the Struggle for Peace and Against Aggressive Imperialist Policy in the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean" (November 1980, Aden), and the International Conference "Women of Europe in the Struggle for Peace" (November 1981, Amsterdam).

A recognition of women's services in the struggle for peace and social progress was the United Nations' proclamation of 1975 an International Women's Year and the following decade—the UN Decade for Women (1976-1985). Its motto is "Equality, Development and Peace". The Soviet Women's Committee contributed in every possible way to the preparation and holding of the UN World Conference in Copenhagen in July 1980, which summed up the results of the first half of the Decade and adopted a programme of action for the second half, up to 1985. The Committee took an active part in the drafting and discussion of the new programme, contributing to the broadest reflection of the theme of peace and disarmament in it.

The Conference adopted a number of important resolutions. Many of them were submitted on the initiative and with the participation of the delegations of socialist and developing countries, among them the resolutions "Women's Participation in the Strengthening of International Peace and Security and in the Struggle Against Colonialism, Racism, Racial Discrimination, Foreign Aggression and Occupation and All Forms of Foreign Domination", "The Role of Women in the Preparation of Society for Life in Peace" and others.

An important event in the international democratic women's movement was the World Women's Congress "For Equality, National Independence and Peace" (October 1981, Prague) in the preparation of which the SWC took an active part. The question of the consolidation of the world public forces in the struggle for peace and disarmament was in the focus of the Congress. Its documents emphasise that the prevention of war and the creation of conditions ensuring lasting peace and international security is the main task of

our time, a decisive element in the activity of national and international women's organisations concerned with the destinies of mankind.

The Soviet Women's Committee sees one of its important tasks in explaining the peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet state to women's public circles abroad. The Committee addresses appeals to all women of the planet and the progressive world public as a whole calling for vigorous action against the designs of aggressive imperialist circles and for most urgent measures to reduce the war danger, to ensure lasting peace for mankind. These appeals were issued, in particular, on the International Day of Women's Struggle for Peace and Disarmament (October 25, 1980) held as part of the UN Week for Disarmament, in March 1981 at a plenary meeting of the SWC and in June 1981 at an enlarged meeting of the SWC Presiding Board held on the 40th anniversary of fascist Germany's attack on the Soviet Union.

The theme of peace and international co-operation is one of the main in women's journals of this country, which have a total circulation of 27 million copies. *Soviet Woman*, the organ of the Committee, is published in more than 2 million copies in 14 languages and is circulated in 140 countries. In its regular column To Ward Off the Threat of the Destruction of Life on Our Planet the journal publishes materials on problems of peace and disarmament contributed not only by Soviet but also foreign authors, and round-table discussions with the participation of specialists on various aspects of disarmament problems, public figures and scientists. The Committee actively co-operates with the WIDF journal *The Women of the Whole World*. This journal carries a regular column Peace and Disarmament.

The Soviet Women's Committee and editors of women's magazines receive many letters from Soviet women in which they express their concern for the future of our planet and write about their readiness to contribute to the best of their abilities to the preservation of peace on Earth. Many of them say that they have remitted their personal savings to the Soviet Peace Fund, of which the Soviet Women's Committee is a founding member. These letters convey Soviet women's fervent desire to live in peace and friendship with all peoples, their concern for future generations and their feeling of responsibility for the destinies of their country and all mankind.

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH COUNCIL ON PEACE AND DISARMAMENT

Professor GRIGORI MOROZOV

International law expert, b. 1921, finished the Moscow Institute of International Relations (1948). Since 1963, he has held the post of Department Chief at the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, USSR Academy of Sciences. Deputy Chairman of the Soviet UN Association, member of the Soviet Peace Committee and the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation; also, Executive Secretary of the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament.

The Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament was established in 1979 by the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the Collegium of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, and the Presidium of the Soviet Peace Committee. The Council is chaired by Academician N. N. Inozemtsev, member of the Central Committee of the CPSU, deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet and member of the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

The establishment of the Council was an important event in the life of the country, for now it had a single research and co-ordination centre to concert the efforts of many Soviet students of peace and disarmament, a most vital and topical international subject. The Council was assigned the function of galvanising comprehensive peace, disarmament and international co-operation research in the Soviet Union, of co-ordinating research in this field, and applying its results to practical efforts for peace and detente.

Another function of the Council is to promote co-operation with foreign research centres and scholars working in the sphere of inter-

national relations and related fields, and with public figures and politicians as well as cultural workers fighting to rid mankind of the arms race and the spectre of nuclear war.

Among the more than 80 members of the Council are outstanding Soviet scholars, both in social and natural sciences, party and public figures, members of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and of the constituent republics, heads of mass organisations, cultural workers and prominent journalists.

The Council deals with serious matters, whose importance is underscored by the grave deterioration of the international situation at the end of the seventies and the beginning of the eighties owing to the sharp departure of the US Administration from the policy of détente.

First of all, the Council attended to organisational matters. The following five sections led by deputy chairmen of the Council were organised: Problems of Disarmament (Academician G. A. Arbatov); Peace and Disarmament and the Developing Countries (Academician E. M. Primakov); Collaboration among Scientists in Studies on Problems of Peace (Academician M. A. Markov); Scientific and Technological Progress and the Fostering of Peace (Academician J. M. Gvishiani), and Problems of Peaceful Coexistence and Strengthening of Detente (Prof. O. N. Bykov). Apart from members of the Council, the sections invite experts and representatives of public and government organisations to take part in their activities. Editorial boards were appointed and preparatory work started on the Council's fundamental work, *Peace and Disarmament. Academic Studies*, and a series of pamphlets on International Peace and Disarmament in five languages—Russian, English, French, German and Spanish. The Soviet Peace Fund agreed to finance the bulk of the Council's research and publications.

After the organisational stage was over, the Council at once tackled its basic tasks. The first general meeting (June 1979) inaugurated the Council, the second (April 1981) discussed the tasks facing scholars and scientists in the light of the decisions and materials of the 26th Congress of the CPSU. A report on this topic was delivered by Academician N. N. Inozemtsev. Other speakers were academicians E. K. Fedorov, G. A. Arbatov, E. M. Primakov, M. A. Markov, J. M. Gvishiani and professors O. N. Bykov and G. I. Morozov. The meeting was particularly important, because all further activities of the Council

were oriented on furthering the Party Congress programme of positive actions for normalising the international situation.

Besides, the Council organised a scientific conference of the USSR Academy of Sciences devoted to the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance (May 1980). The main speaker was Academician Inozemtsev.

Another important undertaking was a two-day scientific co-ordination conference in March 1980 of scientists from nine socialist countries (Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the GDR, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia) which reviewed joint research for peace and disarmament and specified further co-operation. Proposals for closer contacts were followed up by visits to the Council of Bulgarian, Hungarian, East German and Czechoslovak scientists in 1981.

The Council promotes joint sponsorship of international forums with the following Soviet public organisations: the Soviet Peace Committee, the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation, the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, and the Executive Committee of the USSR Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. Listed below are joint forums held in Moscow: an international symposium on urgent problems of European security and detente (April 1981); a Soviet-French seminar on constitutional law, foreign policy, co-operation, and disarmament (March 1980); a Soviet-British seminar on international detente and disarmament (September-October, 1980); a symposium on environmental protection—an imperative need of our time (October 1979); etc.

The Council has started to publish its own papers and those prepared by its sections in co-operation with institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences. *Peace and Disarmament. Academic Studies* is the leading publication of the Council. The first book came off the press in 1980. The following brochures of the International Peace and Disarmament series have been published: *Europe Before a Choice: Confrontation or Relaxation of Military Tension* with an introduction by N. N. Inozemtsev (1980); M. A. Markov's *Science and the Responsibility of Scientists*; *Disarmament and Environment* (edited by E. K. Fedorov and R. A. Novikov); *Scientific Aspects of Political Talks* by E. K. Fedorov (1981); and *The Threat to Europe* (published jointly with the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-opera-

tion in late 1981). A number of other booklets of this series is being prepared for publication. A Soviet bibliography, *The Public in the Struggle for Peace* (Editor-in-Chief V. S. Bruskov), put out in 1980, is available to readers abroad.

Along with its research and publishing activities the Council offers scientific advice and aid to Soviet public organisations. In 1979-1981 Council members have been included as experts and advisers on delegations sent by public organisations to many international forums within the framework of the Vienna International Institute for Peace, the World Peace Council, the World Federation of Scientific Workers, and the Pugwash and Dartmouth movements, the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace in Sofia, the Madrid meeting of non-governmental organisations on European security, the International Forum on Science and Disarmament, the Soviet-Japanese symposium on the problems of peace and security in Asia, the symposium "Soviet-Indian Co-operation—Important Factor of Asian Stability", the international symposium on problems of peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region, the ECE meeting on environmental protection, various functions sponsored by the Soviet UN Association, etc. Experts from the Council furnish public organisations with analytical material on such major problems as military detente in Europe, the specious "Soviet war threat" campaign and its origins; the dangerous plans for a "Eurostrategic force" stemming from NATO's decision to instal US medium-range missiles in Western Europe; US policies hostile to peace and the increasing US military presence in various regions, first of all the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean; arms sales; the reasons for the anti-Soviet "human rights" campaign; military budgets; global use of outer space for peaceful purposes; conversion of the war industry to civilian production and many others.

Extending contacts and co-operation with foreign research centres and scientists is another important aspect of the Council's activities. The preparation and publication (in 1982) of the handbook *International Non-Governmental Organisations and Institutions* (Editor-in-Chief V. S. Shaposhnikov) is one of the practical results of these activities.

The Council has played host to many foreign scientists and representatives of national and international organisations. Among the visitors were scientists from the USA, Switzerland, Italy, India, Japan, Sweden, Iceland, Norway, etc.; members of the UNO and UNESCO

secretariats; representatives of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI)—Director Frank Barnaby, Chairman of the Governing Board Rolf Bjornerstedt and leading researcher Frank Blackaby; Prof. R. Hermann of University of Pittsburgh (USA); Director of the Austrian Institute for International Affairs Prof. K. Birnbaum, and others. These meetings made possible a broad exchange of views on topical problems of international relations with leading Western scientists; the concepts on peace and disarmament of Soviet scholars were set forth to the visitors. As a rule, the visits led to extended scientific contacts, exchange of literature, etc.

The Council has studied the activity of the main foreign research centres dealing with problems of peace and international conflicts. It is also analysing and summing up Soviet peace and disarmament research experience. With this aim in view information has been collected on what is being done in this field by Soviet research, academic, government and public organisations. This information is made available to all interested research centres and public organisations. The Council also helps to co-ordinate peace and disarmament research in the Soviet Union by collecting and disseminating the research plans of all pertinent Soviet centres. The surveys give an idea of the range of problems investigated and their press coverage (books and other materials to be published).

It stands to reason that all the sections of the Council have been involved in this work. In addition, each section had its own plan of work. Discussion of urgent scientific problems is the main form of activity. For example, the Problems of Disarmament section reviewed the progress of disarmament negotiations in the light of the US new Administration's policies; also, it had a joint meeting with colleagues from other socialist countries in the UN Disarmament Committee. The section Peace and Disarmament and the Developing Countries held a series of meetings to discuss the following problem: "Developing nations: possible spread of nuclear weapons. Fighting for nuclear non-proliferation." Members of the Scientific and Technological Progress and the Fostering of Peace section discussed peace and disarmament in the light of the scientific and technical revolution with delegations of communist and workers' parties from a number of capitalist countries. The Collaboration among Scientists in Studies on Problems of Peace section reviewed problems related to the conversion of the military industry to civilian production.

As a rule, the materials of these meetings are published and disseminated.

The sections of the Council put out monographs jointly with institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The section on Problems of Peaceful Coexistence and Strengthening of Detente has collaborated with the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences in writing a collective monograph entitled *Military Detente*, which reviews the main trends of the struggle to curb the arms race and relieve the military confrontation. Another fundamental monograph entitled *Detente and Ideological Struggle* (published in 1981) throws light on the intricate relationship of ideas in the international battle for a better political climate and extended co-operation between states with different social systems. Still another joint work recently completed is entitled *NATO: Military and Strategic Concepts*.

Peace and Disarmament and the Developing Countries section and the Institute of Oriental Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences have produced a collective work entitled *Problems of Disarmament and the Developing Nations*. Another collective monograph entitled *Definition of Aggression and International Law* is being prepared jointly with the Institute of the State and Law of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Members of the Council sections regularly publish their articles in Soviet and foreign magazines. For example, members of the Scientific and Technological Progress and the Fostering of Peace section have prepared accounts of the achievements of Soviet science and engineering for peace and extended international co-operation for French, Italian, Finnish and US periodicals.

This is a short account of what the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament has been doing in recent years. Much more work lies ahead for Soviet scholars who consider peace research a major area of their joint scientific endeavour.

SOVIET TRADE UNIONS

ALEXANDER SUBBOTIN

Journalist and publisher, b. 1924. He began his career in 1942 as a factory worker in Elektrostal. Graduated from the Moscow Pedagogical Institute in 1958. In 1951-1963 he was Editor-in-Chief of the *Moskovsky Komsomolets* and then *Moskovskaya Pravda* newspapers, from 1963 to 1980 Editor-in-Chief of the *Trud*, a daily of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions (AUCCTU). Secretary and member of the Presidium of the AUCCTU since 1980. He is a deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and Chairman of the Commission on Social Questions of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation.

The struggle for peace is one of the main directions in the work of Soviet trade unions, the most mass-based public organisation of the USSR uniting on a voluntary basis industrial workers and office employees of all trades and professions (more than 130 million members at present). Soviet trade unions view the tasks set by the 26th Congress of the CPSU in the struggle for peace and international co-operation as their uppermost concern, as a concrete programme of practical actions the implementation of which meets the vital interests of the working people and nations of the whole planet.

The activity of Soviet trade unions in defence of peace is closely and inseparably connected with their vigorous actions for the unity of the international trade union movement. Already the First All-Russia Trade Union Congress (1918) set the task of contributing to the revival of the international trade union movement and convocation of a world trade union congress. Supporting this idea, the Fourth All-Russia Trade Union Conference (March 1918) proposed discussing at the congress the question of stepping up the struggle of the working class in the belligerent countries (the Conference met when the First World War was still going on) against imperialism and imperialist

war and achieving unity of action of working people to this end.

In December 1922 representatives of Soviet trade unions at the Hague Peace Congress set forth a concrete anti-war programme of trade union action. In June 1923 the ARCCTU (All-Russia, now All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, guiding the activity of trade unions between congresses of Soviet trade unions) came forward with the proposal to call a joint meeting of trade union centres affiliated with the Red International of Trade Unions and the Amsterdam International¹ "to work out a programme of action against the war menace and fascist reaction". In the subsequent years Soviet trade unions repeatedly reaffirmed their proposal but it was not supported by the trade union centres of the leading capitalist countries despite the fact that the situation in the world was becoming more and more alarming.

Soviet trade unions worked actively for the unity of the working class on an anti-war platform within the framework of the Red International of Trade Unions, the Anglo-Russian Committee of Trade Union Unity and the Norwegian-Finnish-Soviet trade union bloc (1928-1931). In 1932, AUCCTU Secretary N. M. Shvernik was elected a member of the International Committee Against Imperialist War formed by the Amsterdam Anti-War Congress. The AUCCTU was most active in preparing the International Congress of Defenders of Peace in Brussels (September 1936), the biggest event of this type before the war. Addressing the Congress, N. M. Shvernik emphasised the uselessness of general discourses about war menace and called for resolute actions against its concrete inspirers. He stressed that "without trade unions there can be no effective international action against warmongers".²

When the world peace movement emerged after the Second World War, the Soviet trade unions immediately joined it, and they have effectively contributed to it ever since.

Questions of labour solidarity in the struggle for peace and curb-

¹ Red International of Trade Unions—international association of revolutionary trade unions which existed from 1921 to 1937. Soviet trade unions were affiliated with it.

Amsterdam International of Trade Unions (International Association of Trade Unions) was the centre of reformist trade unions set up at a congress in Amsterdam in 1919. Its dissolution was announced in 1945.

² *Communist International*, No. 15, September 1936, p. 82.

ing of the arms race figure prominently in the international ties of Soviet trade unions with the trade union associations of socialist, developing and capitalist countries. They concentrate their efforts on the following main directions:

—bringing home to the people that the arms race not only threatens mankind with a catastrophe, but that already in peacetime it brings hardships and privations for the working people in non-socialist countries, depresses their living standards, intensifies inflation and increases unemployment;

—demonstrating to the working people that imposing social and economic tasks could be solved through a reduction of military expenditures;

—exposing the theories about the supposedly beneficial effect of the arms race on the economy and employment and showing that such theories serve only the interests of the military-industrial complex for which arms manufacture is a lucrative business with profits the higher the more pitched is the tension in the world and the higher the escalation of the arms race;

—demonstrating by concrete facts that the switch-over of military production to peaceful lines fully meets the interests of working people, as testified by the reconversion of the military industry carried out after the Second World War in the USSR and a number of other countries.

In tackling these objectives, Soviet trade unions act jointly with the trade union centres of fraternal socialist countries, relying on tried and tested forms of co-operation. In particular, this concerns joint discussion of major questions, drafting co-ordination plans, mutual study and utilisation of practical experience, multilateral and bilateral consultations.

The striving to reveal more deeply the real causes of the aggravation of international tensions, the social roots of the arms race is in the focus of the activity of Soviet trade unions and trade union centres of fraternal socialist countries in the World Federation of Trade Unions and the affiliated International Trade Union Associations. The world trade union congresses held in 1945-1978 in Paris, Milan, Vienna, Leipzig, Moscow, Warsaw, Budapest, Varna and Prague became important landmarks in the anti-war movement of the working people of the whole world. A big role in mobilising the working people and trade unions of the world for the struggle against the threat of war was

played by the Tenth World Trade Union Congress (Havana, February 1982).

In our days, when the impact of the international trade union movement on social development is growing more and more, it has a higher role and responsibility in the struggle for peace, detente and disarmament. These aims fully accord with the vital class interests of all working people. This is why trade unions of different orientations in the majority of the countries not only supported the policy of detente and the results of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, but also actively joined in the struggle for the implementation of the adopted decisions. They took part in the European public assemblies in Brussels in 1972 and 1975, in the work of the World Congress of Peace Forces and the World Forum of Peace Forces held in Moscow in 1973 and 1977.

The 16th Congress of Soviet Trade Unions (March 1977) set the task of "working still more actively for the strengthening of detente, for cessation of the arms race, for disarmament". The Congress adopted an appeal to the working people and trade unions of the world urging them to make vigorous efforts in order to prevent the material preparation of war which poses a serious threat to the security of all peoples.

On the initiative of Soviet trade unions, the Conference of Non-Governmental Organisations which met in Geneva in 1978 forwarded to the First Special Session on Disarmament of the UN General Assembly (May-June 1978) a document in which it drew attention to the negative consequences of the arms race for the social and economic position of the working people. These questions were raised by representatives of Soviet trade unions at the international seminar "Alternatives to Arms Production" (London, November 1978) and at the international symposium "The Working People of Europe and Social Aspects of Disarmament at the Present Stage" sponsored by the AUCCTU jointly with the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation (Moscow, February 1979).

A Memorandum of the AUCCTU, which contained the proposal for reaching agreement on concrete joint actions of trade unions in the struggle against the mounting war menace, against the attempts to push the world back to the times of the cold war and to impose a new round of the arms race on the peoples was circulated at the 3rd European Trade Union Conference (Geneva, October 1979) attended by

leading functionaries of trade union centres of different orientations from European countries who represented all major trends of the international trade union movement. Soviet trade unions declared their readiness to play a most active part in the initiative in this field undertaken by trade union centres in any country. This proposal became particularly important in view of the intention of the aggressive NATO circles to station new American medium-range nuclear missiles in a number of West European countries.

Questions of trade union action against the war menace were in prominence also at the 4th European Trade Union Conference (Geneva, November 1981). Its participants spoke in favour of reaching decisions in the course of the Soviet-American talks in Geneva on liquidation of all nuclear weapons sited in Europe and targeted on Europe.

A notable event in the world trade union movement, connected with its struggle for the strengthening of peace and detente, was the international round-table conference of trade unionists within the framework of the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace in Sofia (September 1980). It was attended by representatives of trade unions of different trends from 83 countries, including a delegation of Soviet trade unions.

The meeting centred on the theme "Detente, Conversion and Disarmament", and the discussion revealed the convergence of trade union positions on the most crucial aspects. A statement was adopted which drew attention to the danger of the arms race imposed by imperialism, to its negative consequences for the vital interests of working people, and emphasised the need to formulate joint programmes of struggle to prevent the war threat, curb the arms race and convert military industry to civilian production.

Soviet trade unions put the questions of the struggle for peace, detente and disarmament in the centre of their bilateral ties.

Every year, we host about 1,000 trade union delegations from socialist, capitalist and newly-free countries and about 800 Soviet delegations go abroad. In the course of these contacts diverse approaches are shaped to the solution of pressing problems of war and peace.

Thus, a bilateral seminar of the AUCCTU and the Confederation of Finnish Trade Unions was held in Helsinki in November 1980, on social and economic aspects of disarmament. This seminar, organised for the first time by trade unions of different orientations belonging to different international trade union centres, graphically demonstrated that they can and must act jointly in the struggle against the arms race

and for the utilisation for the benefit of working people of the vast potential sacrificed to militarism.

A notable development in the relations between Soviet and Japanese trade unions are traditional mass Soviet-Japanese trade union meetings "For Peace and Friendship Between the Peoples of the Soviet Union and Japan". These meetings, held alternately in the USSR and Japan, are attended on the Soviet side by front-rank workers in production and trade union activists, representing working people of all Union republics and major industrial centres of the country. On the Japanese side their participants include workers and trade union activists representing the leading union centres of the country—the General Council of Trade Unions of Japan (SOHYO) and the Independent Trade Union Liaison Organisation. Discussions at these meetings centre on pressing problems of the working-class struggle for peace and social progress, and against imperialism and reaction, on questions of the further development of friendly ties between the trade unions of both countries. Soviet-Japanese trade union meetings serve to strengthen the class solidarity and contribute to goodneighbourly relations between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Japan. The last two meetings were held in August 1979 in the USSR and in September-October 1981 in Japan.

In recent years the AUCCTU has hosted large groups of workers and trade union activists (100 to 320 members) from Austria, Finland, the FRG and Schotland. These forms of international trade union contacts open up new prospects for joint actions in defence of peace.

On the initiative of Soviet trade unions, a Resolution Concerning the Economic and Social Consequences of Disarmament was submitted to the General Conference of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). It had broad support above all in the "worker's group". The resolution was adopted at the 67th ILO General Conference (June 1981).

Soviet trade unions actively participate in a number of international anti-war trade union actions. One of them was an international trade union round-table conference on the economic and social aspects of disarmament in connection with young workers, held in Berlin in April 1980. It centred attention on the analysis of the negative effects of the arms race on the education and employment of the youth. It was attended by trade union representatives from 12 countries and three international organisations. Problems of education of youth in the spirit of peace were discussed at a seminar sponsored by the World Federation

of Scientific Workers in March 1980 in Warsaw. Another international seminar sponsored by the Federation, "Disarmament and Development" (Vienna, April 1980), was a success too. It showed that the continuing arms race was one of the main obstacles in overcoming the backwardness of developing countries, in their social and economic progress.

The negative effect of the arms race on the pressing housing problem and the favourable prospects opening up in this field in conditions of disarmament were discussed at an international seminar organised by the Trade Union International of Workers of Building, Wood, and Building Materials Industries (Vienna, April 1980).

One of the most imposing anti-war actions of trade unions in recent years was the World Trade Union Conference on Social and Economic Aspects of Disarmament (Paris, December 1981) which brought together representatives of 115 trade unions affiliated to the WFTU, ICFTU and WCL from 62 countries and also 23 international trade union and other organisations, including the UN, ILO and UNESCO. The declaration adopted by the Conference unanimously formulates the tasks of trade unions in the struggle for peace, against the arms race. The Conference, in particular, condemned the plans of the United States and NATO for stationing new American missiles in Western Europe and the decision of the US President on the production of neutron weapons.

Growing activity of trade unions in the struggle for peace, preservation of detente, for the curbing of the arms race and for disarmament is one of the salient features of the present-day anti-war movement. The world trade union movement more and more widely supports the position of class trade unions which view detente and disarmament as the only rational alternative to the imperialist policy of the arms race and as an important factor in the struggle for the vital interests of working people. Questions of intensification of the working people's anti-war struggle were discussed extensively at the 17th Congress of Soviet Trade Unions (March 1982). Of special importance are the new peaceful proposals put forward by Leonid Brezhnev in his speech at the Congress. The Congress supported the idea of the Tenth World Trade Union Congress concerning the proclamation of September 1 a Day of Trade Union Action for Peace. In the appeal to the working people and trade unions of the world the Congress called for giving resolute rebuff to the designs of imperialism and working actively for joint action by the anti-war movement.

THE SOVIET COMMITTEE OF WAR VETERANS

ALEKSEI MARESYEV

Air pilot, public figure, b. 1916. Graduate of the Bataisk Military Air College (1940), Higher Party School (1952) and Academy of Social Sciences (1956). During the Great Patriotic War of 1941-45 commander of an air flight of a fighter wing, assistant wing commander and navigation officer. Early in the war brought down 4 enemy planes. In April 1942 Aleksei Maresyev's plane was hit in action. Critically wounded, Maresyev landed on enemy territory. For 18 days he crawled to the frontline. After the amputation of the shins of both legs he developed perfect command of his prostheses and on his personal application was posted in June 1943 to a Guards fighter wing. Brought down 7 more enemy planes. Retired major since July 1946. Executive Secretary of the Soviet Committee of War Veterans since 1956.

The Soviet Committee of War Veterans (SCWV) represents the interests of the millions of those who with arms in hand defended the freedom and independence of the socialist Homeland. The Committee was formed in 1956 and in September 1981 observed its 25th anniversary. It unites the efforts of Soviet war veterans aimed at safeguarding peace, at promoting ties with international and national organisations of war veterans in different countries coming out against the threat of a new war, for friendship and co-operation of the peoples, at fulfilling the national economic plans of the USSR and at educating the Soviet youth in a patriotic and internationalist spirit. The Committee has sections in the capitals of Union republics, hero cities (this honourable title has been conferred on Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Odessa, Sevastopol, Volgograd, Novorossiisk, Kerch, Minsk and Tula), in Brest Fortress and

large territorial and regional centres of the Soviet Union. The highest leading body is the All-Union Conference of War Veterans, and between conferences the Plenum of the Committee. In October 1981 the Fifth All-Union Conference of War Veterans was held. Colonel-General A. S. Zheltov, Hero of the Soviet Union, was elected Chairman of the Committee. The participants in the Conference adopted an appeal to the former fighters at the front, Resistance fighters and inmates of fascist concentration camps urging them to step up the struggle for ending the arms race.

The organisation of war veterans is the custodian of extensive concrete and unique military experience and traditions. The Committee cultivates these traditions and passes them on to the younger generations, while also taking part in solving present-day problems of war and peace. In this way it contributes to the execution of the peace policy pursued by the CPSU and the Soviet state.

In its international activity the Committee helps implement the Soviet Peace Programme, which was further developed at the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Soviet war veterans are deeply convinced that the strengthening of peace, progress in the field of disarmament, and the exclusion of war as a means of settling inter-state political problems are an objective imperative of the time. Nuclear war, far from helping attain any political aims, would call in question the continuation of life on our planet. War veterans are particularly aware of this, it is a realisation stemming from their own experience of life and the historical results of the Second World War.

The SCWV takes an active part in the struggle against the arms race, for disarmament. It has repeatedly published statements in the press exposing the opponents of international detente. Committee members (280 of them) and activists regularly write on disarmament in the Soviet and foreign press and appear in Moscow Radio programmes for listeners abroad.

The Committee has extensive and many-sided international ties. For instance, we closely co-operate with the organisations of war veterans in socialist countries on questions of the struggle for detente and disarmament.

As a member of the International Federation of Resistance Movements, which unites 64 national organisations in 24 countries (chiefly European) and in West Berlin, the Committee strives to invigorate the

Federation's actions for disarmament and broader co-operation with other international organisations of war veterans. The Committee is also a member of the International Committees of former inmates of fascist concentration camps at Oświęcim, Dachau, Mauthausen, Buchenwald, Sachsenhausen, Neuengamme, Ravensbrück and Rombergpark.

The most impressive demonstration of the war veterans' will for peace was the World Conference of War Veterans for Disarmament held in October 1979 in Rome. The SCWV too contributed to its preparation. Representatives of more than 250 national veterans' organisations from more than 50 countries of five continents attended the Conference. One should bear in mind that veterans of the Second World War, partisans, victims and prisoners of fascism, former POWs and deported persons in capitalist countries are united in organisations which have different political orientations. Some, though uniting our former war enemies, today act in common with us in working for lasting peace. Hence the importance of international forums making it possible to pool forces so diverse socially and politically in the struggle for the preservation and strengthening of peace, for disarmament. The Conference in Rome adopted a Message to the Governments and Peoples of the World emphasising the need for effective measures to end the arms race and welcoming efforts aimed at strengthening peace and security and achieving mutual trust between peoples.

The organisations that had sponsored the World Conference set up a Co-ordinating Committee to promote co-operation between veterans' organisations in different countries. Thus, at its session in April 1980 in Paris the Committee decided to establish contacts with the delegations to the Madrid CSCE follow-up meeting.

On behalf of millions of war veterans the Co-ordinating Committee urged all states to observe unswervingly the provisions of the Final Act adopted in 1975 in Helsinki at the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and supported the proposal for calling a European conference on military detente and disarmament. The Committee charted a programme of action in support of the Second Special UN Session on Disarmament scheduled for the summer of 1982.

Our ties with national organisations of war veterans are growing closer. In September 1981 an SCWV delegation visited Spain at the invitation of the Association of Republican Air Pilots. This was the

first visit of a delegation of the Committee to this country at the invitation of a war veterans' organisation.

Soviet representatives participated in the session of the Bureau of the International Federation of Resistance Movements in Budapest in September 1981 which adopted the resolution "Stop the Race to the Abyss!" directed against the arms drive, the deployment of new American medium-range missiles in Europe and the production of the neutron bomb. The session directed a message to the UN Secretary-General calling for more vigorous UN action for disarmament, and a telegram to the participants in the Madrid meeting urging them to support an early conference on military detente and disarmament.

In October 1981 an SCWV delegation took part in the first international conference of liberators of the prisoners of nazi concentration camps, which met in Washington with delegations from 13 countries attending.

The Soviet Committee of War Veterans considers it its duty to continue to expand international co-operation with organisations of war veterans with the aim of mobilising broad public circles for the struggle against the arms race, for disarmament and the consolidation of peace.

THE SOVIET COMMITTEE FOR EUROPEAN SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION

ALEKSEI CHITIKOV

Statesman and party functionary, b. 1912. Graduate of the Gorky Agricultural Institute (1936) and the Higher Party School (1941). During the Great Patriotic War of 1941-45 was a political worker in the Soviet Army. After the war, party worker in the Khabarovsk Territory. Aleksei Chitikov is a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. Since 1970, Chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet and Chairman of the Parliamentary Group of the USSR. He is also Chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation.

The Soviet public takes an active part in the movement for European security. This movement arose at the end of the sixties and the beginning of the seventies. Democratic opinion in Europe actively supported the idea of calling the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and establishing an effective system of security and mutually beneficial co-operation between all states. The starting premise was that the activity of public forces can back up the peace initiatives of governments or influence governments in favour of peace, that public opinion and official circles, acting in their respective fields, can contribute to accomplishing the common task of forming a new system of international relations in Europe.

A meeting of representatives of public organisations held on June 8, 1971, formed the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation. In the past decade documentary material has been accumulated, a certain amount of research has been carried out concerning

public actions for peace, security, disarmament and co-operation in Europe and literature on the subject has appeared.¹

In their inaugural statement, the sponsors of the Committee—the Parliamentary Group of the USSR, the USSR Academy of Sciences and the representatives of public organisations such as the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, the Young Communist League and the Committee of Youth Organisations of the USSR, the Novosti Press Agency, the Soviet Women's Committee, and the creative workers' unions—expressed their deep conviction that it was necessary to launch vigorous actions of public forces in different countries in the interests of safeguarding security in Europe, in the name of peace and co-operation on the European continent.²

The sponsors of the Committee, supporting the idea of joint actions by public forces in all European countries, set before it the task of taking an active part in all campaigns of broad European public forces sincerely seeking durable peace and security on our continent.

The Committee was to develop contacts with organisations and public figures abroad coming out for peace and security in Europe, seek, through exchange of views and businesslike discussions, co-ordination of views of representatives of public forces in different European countries and to contribute to the search for and elaboration of new constructive ideas aimed at turning Europe into a continent of peaceful co-operation among nations.

The establishment of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation as a co-ordinating organ afforded the Soviet public the possibility of participating still more actively in the European dia-

¹ See, in particular, V. S. Shaposhnikov, "The Role of the Public in the Struggle for European Security" (in the book *Peace and Disarmament. Academic Studies*, 1980, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1980); N. A. Pankov, "Public Opinion in the Struggle for Security and Co-operation in Europe" (in *European Security and Co-operation: Prerequisites, Problems, Prospects*, Moscow, 1976); the monograph *Public Opinion and Problems of War and Peace*, Moscow, 1978; E. K. Silin, "The Public of Europe for Security and Peace" (*Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya*, No. 6, 1978); E. Konstantinov, "Peace and Security for Europe" (*International Affairs*, No. 4, 1981); *Information Bulletin* of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation, Moscow, 1971-81.

² See *Materials of the Meeting of Representatives of the Soviet Public Devoted to the Establishment of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation*, Moscow, 1971.

logue and the collective efforts for genuine security and mutually beneficial co-operation on the European continent.

The Soviet public was not only a witness but also a most active participant in the birth and growth of the movement for European security.

It took part in the 1972 and 1975 Brussels Assemblies of Public Forces for Security and Co-operation in Europe, which contributed to overcoming the barriers and obstacles to mutual understanding and co-operation artificially raised during the years of the cold war.

In his message of greetings to the first Assembly Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, emphasised: "The public of Europe has real possibilities for continuing to play an important role in shaping the destinies of peace on our continent. Without consistent and steadfast efforts of the public it is impossible to finally clear away the barriers left behind by the cold war and isolate the militarist, revanchist and conservative forces opposing detente. It is called upon to speak up for the promotion of mutual trust between the nations and for organising all-round peaceful co-operation of European states."¹

From the outset, the Committee has focussed on the tasks set by the Peace Programme put forward and developed by the CPSU at its recent congresses. These tasks are the Committee's main guides.

All-out contribution to the implementation of all the provisions of the Final Act of the European Conference underlies the activity of the Committee as a national organisation participating in the European movement and the work of the International Committee for European Security and Co-operation, whose Secretariat has its headquarters in Brussels.

In keeping with its specific features, its geographical orientation and its tasks determined, in particular, by the decisions of the European Conference in Helsinki, the Committee holds a place of its own in the system of Soviet public organisations acting in defence of peace and security, for the consolidation of detente and an end to the arms race.

Together with the peace-loving public of Europe the Soviet public, participating in the movement for peace and security on our continent, resolutely opposes the NATO plans for stationing new American me-

¹ *The Brussels Assembly of Public Forces for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Moscow, 1972, p. 4.*

dium-range nuclear missiles in a number of West European countries and comes out against the neutron bomb. There has not been a single important event in international life on the European continent to which the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation has failed to respond.

The work of the Committee develops along three main lines: international ties and exchange of delegations, participation in various international and national activities in the USSR and abroad, scientific and information work.

The programme of the Committee's work in the respective fields is drawn up by specialised public commissions functioning under the Committee and dealing respectively with problems of European security, economic and cultural ties and co-operation, and social aspects of European security.

The Committee maintains ties with national organisations of the movement for European security and co-operation. Every year it receives up to 40 delegations of national committees and foreign public leaders who come to familiarise themselves with the Committee's activities and exchange views on urgent international problems. About as many Committee delegations go abroad.

Committee representatives participate in various conferences, symposia, meetings and seminars devoted to problems of European security and co-operation, e.g., conferences on East-West economic co-operation, activities sponsored by the Haus Rissen Institute in Hamburg, the Political Club of West Berlin, and the like. In the past years the Committee has organised a series of conferences, seminars, meetings, colloquia and other activities in the Soviet Union involving the participation of foreign public leaders.

The Committee's information service and individual Committee members and activists use various forms and methods in publicising the Helsinki accords and the benefits of detente.

The work of the Committee is reported in its *Information Bulletin* appearing in Russian, English, French and German in a total circulation of 6,000 copies. An important element of the information activity was the participation of Soviet scientists and specialists in preparing the pamphlets of the International Committee, *From Helsinki to Belgrade* (1977) and *From Helsinki to Madrid* (1980).

The European public appraised the completion of many years' work on *Poetry of Europe*, a three-volume anthology of the best works

by European authors, published in the Soviet Union in 1977 on the Committee's initiative, as a concrete contribution to the implementation of the Helsinki accords on the "third basket". In November 1980, a collection of papers by European authors entitled *Europe: 20th Century* was published to coincide with the opening of the Madrid meeting (in German and Russian, each edition in 10,000 copies). It was brought out on the initiative of the Committee and the Rhine-Westphalia Foreign Society (FRG). The publication of the collection and of *Poetry of Europe* is evidence of the efforts made by the Soviet public, in particular, the Writers' Union of the USSR and the Khudozhestvennaya Literatura Publishing House, to implement the Helsinki accords on the development of cultural co-operation between the peoples of the European continent.

Through the mass media Committee representatives call attention to the activity of Soviet public organisations in behalf of lasting peace and genuine security in Europe. Problems of security and peaceful co-operation are analysed in the works of scholars who are members of the Committee, and in publications of the Committee telling about its various activities.¹

On March 24, 1981, the Committee met in a plenary session, to discuss its pressing tasks. The session was unanimous in the view that the peaceful proposals put forward by Leonid Brezhnev at the 26th CPSU Congress had given a new powerful impulse to the actions of the peace-loving public seeking to make its contribution to military detente and disarmament in Europe. The plenum expressed its firm conviction that the Soviet public expanding ties and co-operation with national organisations and movements of peace forces in other countries, would continue to take an active part in the struggle to promote security and co-operation in Europe.

In April 1981 Moscow was the venue of an international symposium

¹ See *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Problems of Economic, Scientific and Technical Co-operation Between European Countries*, Moscow, February 1972; *Problems of Economic Co-operation Between the East and West of Europe* (Proceedings of the International Conference of Economists of the CMEA Countries and Yugoslavia, Moscow, 1973); *European Economic Co-operation* (1973); *European Security and Co-operation: Prerequisites, Problems, Prospects* (1976); A. Efremov, *Nuclear Disarmament* (1976); *Social Aspects of European Security* (1978); *Social Problems of Ecology and the Modern Age* (1978) (all in Russian).

organised by the Soviet Committee and the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament. It was a serious discussion of pressing problems of detente and disarmament with the participation of eminent scientists, journalists, senators, MPs and other political and public leaders from 21 European countries and Canada.

In the focus of the discussion were the constructive proposals put forward by Leonid Brezhnev at the 26th CPSU Congress. Most speakers concentrated on the United States' intention to deploy new medium-range missiles in Europe and the moratorium proposed by the USSR. Many of them declared in favour of early negotiations on these problems. It was emphasised that, with the international situation growing tenser, dialogue between the countries of East and West, including public forces, is of vast importance for promoting mutual understanding and the search for new possibilities to maintain and promote detente. In the course of the discussion, the role of small and medium-sized countries in contributing to the positive development of the European process, in strengthening peace and security on the continent, was stressed.

As a national organisation of the Soviet public, our Committee strives to make its contribution to the activity of the International Committee for European Security and Co-operation, which stimulates the dialogue and comparison of the positions of diverse public circles on problems of Europe's present and future. Of great importance in this respect were the European Public Forum for Disarmament and Security (October 1979, De Haan, Belgium) and the Dialogue: Madrid-80 meeting of European public leaders in Brussels in November 1980, both called on the initiative of the International Committee, and both attended by our representatives.

The International Committee was the initiator of five colloquia on the reduction of armaments in Europe. The fourth colloquium was organised in March 1980 in Moscow by the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation and the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament.

The International Committee has won the recognition of the international community and been granted consultative status by UNESCO and the Economic and Social Council. The Soviet public sees in the International Committee an authoritative organisation which has every possibility to ensure that the European public contributes still more effectively to the strengthening of security on the continent.

By participating in the activities of our Committee, the Soviet public conducts a dialogue with representatives of public opinion abroad on cardinal problems of our time.

The pressing and burning problems require solution without delay. At the initial stage, when the movement arose, the situation in Europe was determined by the striving of political and public forces for detente in international relations, for contacts and co-operation. With the development of European detente, the situation changed. Big headway had been made in relaxing tensions and considerable progress achieved in many fields: in the initiation and expansion of political meetings and talks, in the development of economic, scientific and technical co-operation, in the field of cultural ties and human contacts. Many Europeans came to feel the tangible fruits of detente, gained by the painstaking efforts of all who are interested in a peaceful present and future for Europe. The objective realities in Europe require persevering, consistent endeavours to prevent the opponents of detente from reversing the trend and reducing the gains of detente to nought. Broad public forces in the West are well aware of the real threat posed by the decision of the NATO Council to go ahead with the plans for the rearmament of the NATO countries and the deployment of new American medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe. It is not surprising therefore that the new Soviet peaceful initiatives have been met with such keen interest in Europe. The majority of Europeans do not want a new nuclear arsenal in their home, they would like to get rid of the nuclear bomb altogether.

The Soviet Committee extends its hand to all public forces in Europe who take an unbiased view of the Soviet Union, who stand on the platform of the Helsinki Final Act and are prepared to conduct a dialogue. The Soviet public is ready to consider any constructive proposals of these public circles.

There was a broad response in the USSR and abroad to the pamphlet *The Threat to Europe* prepared by the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation and the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament and brought out by Progress Publishers in October 1981. This topical publication shows the real causes of the dangerous state of the international situation: the obstinate attempts by militarist circles in the West to alter the established

balance of forces in the world and in Europe in their favour, their tension-building, the arms race unleashed by the imperialist states. The pamphlet also shows how European security can be safeguarded.

There is a real way out of the international impasses created by the advocates of tension. As the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation pointed out at its meeting in July 1981, this is the message of the Appeal "To the Parliaments and Peoples of the World", adopted by the session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on June 23, 1981. Concrete ways and means of improving the climate in Europe and all over the world are indicated by the principled Leninist policy of peace. The Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation strives to make its contribution to its realisation, to the implementation of the Peace Programme for the 80s.

THE SOVIET PEACE COMMITTEE

OLEG KHARKHARDIN

Historian and political analyst, b. 1927. Finished the Moscow Institute of International Relations (1953), was Deputy Director of that institute from 1956 to 1958, a full-time member of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee from 1958 to 1963. Deputy Chairman of the Soviet Peace Committee from 1973 to 1980 and First Deputy Chairman since 1980. Member of the World Peace Council. A member of the Bureau of the Soviet Peace Fund Board and the Bureau of the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament.

The Soviet Peace Committee (SPC) founded in 1949 is a public co-ordinating body of the peace movement in the USSR. It is one of the channels through which Soviet public opinion contributes to the formulation and practical implementation of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union.

The Committee represents all social strata; more specifically, it includes representatives of all major public organisations, of the personnel of major industrial and agricultural enterprises, research institutions, educational establishments, the mass media, etc., all in all 450 men and women of various nationalities and occupations, Communist party members, non-party people and members of the clergy. There are republican peace committees in the 14 Union and 16 autonomous republics of the country. With territorial and regional committees added, the number of local committees totals 120.

The supreme body of the peace movement in the USSR is the National Conference which convenes regularly (the last one was held

in Moscow on December 12, 1979) and elects the Soviet Peace Committee. The Committee holds plenary meetings annually. The conferences and plenary meetings formulate the main political tasks and directions of work. The Presidium, 70 members elected at a plenary meeting of the Committee, guides the day-to-day activities. The Chairman of the Committee (since March 1982, G. A. Zhukov, deputy of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR), his deputies and the executive secretary form the Bureau of the Presidium and meet regularly to discuss practical matters. Save for a modest technical and information staff, all work of the Committee and its steering bodies is done by members on a voluntary basis. The same applies to the Committee's four commissions: on disarmament, on development, for contacts in the cultural world, and the information commission.

Like the Soviet peace movement as a whole, the Committee is financed entirely by the donations of millions of citizens to the Soviet Peace Fund.¹

The Committee endeavours to provide a constant and comprehensive flow of information to the public in the USSR and in other countries. The leading topics concern world political developments relating to international peace, developments in the peace movement throughout the world and the main directions of Soviet foreign policy.

Special attention is devoted to the peace initiatives advanced by the 26th Congress of the CPSU. The new Soviet peace initiatives are addressed not only to the governments and parliaments of all countries, not only to statesmen and professional politicians, but also to the public at large. A resolution of the plenary meeting of the Soviet Peace Committee of March 1981 emphasised that Soviet peace champions would be seeking implementation of the Peace Programme for the 1980s formulated by the 26th Congress of the CPSU.

The present international situation has become tense as a result of the aggressive actions of imperialist forces. It is therefore of paramount importance to develop broad dialogue and co-operation with political and public anti-war organisations. This guideline is followed by the Soviet Peace Committee in building its contacts with political and public organisations and movements in other countries.

An example of fruitful co-operation in this field is the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace convened in Sofia in September 1980

¹ See the article "The Soviet Peace Fund" in this section of the book.

on the initiative of the World Peace Council (WPC). The Soviet Peace Committee helped prepare and conduct this largest of the recent peace forums, which brought together representatives of various public and political forces of 137 countries.

The Parliament called on the nations to launch a resolute campaign for peace in 1981 so as to make the 1980s a decade of new important accomplishments in the fight for disarmament, detente, national liberation, justice, democracy and social progress.

There is a growing conviction in the world that dialogue is necessary to preserve and expand detente and to consolidate international peace. This is borne out by a number of international meetings held in 1980-1981 between representatives of various political and public bodies. Soviet public figures participated in them. The international forum "Dialogue on Problems of Disarmament and Detente" in Vienna in May 1980 was attended by prominent representatives of 62 social-democratic, Christian democratic, conservative, liberal, communist and other parties, and mass non-governmental organisations of 38 countries. The decisions passed at that forum are evidence that people with different views and convictions can be brought together by their common desire to prevent another war, and that they can co-operate towards this end.

A broad cross-section of public opinion was also reflected in the International Conference of Parliamentarians for Peace, Disarmament and International Security held in Helsinki in May 1980. The same year, Soviet delegations took part in international conferences "For Peace and Security in Asia" (in Delhi, March), "Vietnam and Peace" (in Hanoi, May) and others.

In 1980-1981, members of the Soviet Peace Committee were on a number of WPC delegations to various countries and continents and took part in four symposiums on current problems of detente and disarmament held under the auspices of the International Institute for Peace in Vienna.

A programme of action for the world peace movement for 1981 was drawn up at the January 1981 meeting of the Bureau of the WPC Presidential Committee in Antananarivo (Madagascar) and at the April meeting of the WPC Presidential Committee in Havana. The programme described the movement against the threat of a nuclear-missile war, that has assumed unprecedented dimensions, as an important factor. The meeting in Antananarivo discussed a public campaign

to make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. In the course of the discussion, speakers expressed strong support for the constructive proposals made by Leonid Brezhnev in his statement in Indian Parliament in December 1980. The meeting in Havana thoroughly analysed past experience and outlined the tasks of world-wide united action against the growing threat of war.

A Soviet delegation attended the International Conference Against the Arms Race and For Disarmament in Europe (Stockholm, June 6-8, 1981) along with numerous representatives of West European organisations which are holding anti-war marches and sponsoring meetings, petitions and appeals against the deployment of new US medium-range missiles in Western Europe.

In the course of the Conference, the Soviet delegation called attention to the fact that while the arms race is material preparation for war, anti-Sovietism and distortion of the peace efforts of the USSR is psychological preparation for war. This point elicited a lively response. Despite certain differences in approach and manner of action among various groups and organisations, the Conference in the Swedish capital showed their unanimity as regards the need to curb the arms race and to start negotiations on reduction of nuclear arms in Europe as soon as possible.

In 1981, SPC representatives also took part in the preparation and work of the WPC-sponsored International Conference of Solidarity with Syria and the Palestine Liberation Organisation (Damascus, June 22-25), the International Conference of Non-Governmental Organisations for Urgent Measures Against the Arms Race (Geneva, August 5-6), held in preparation for the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament, and the International Conference for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (Tokyo, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, August 3-9).

In 1981 and early 1982 representatives of the Soviet public participated in the preparation and holding of an important international rally, the World Conference: "Dialogue on Problems of Disarmament and Detente" (Vienna, January 29-February 1, 1982). The Conference was sponsored by the International Forum for Contacts Between Peace Forces set up after the Moscow Congress of Peace Forces in 1973 as a channel for constructive dialogue between representatives of various political parties, international non-governmental organisations and mass anti-war movements and coalitions. Its call for discussion as a

way towards understanding, co-operation and joint action finds support among politically and socially diverse anti-war movements. The World Conference discussed a wide range of problems of disarmament and international security, and a number of socio-economic developments associated with the arms race.

The Soviet peace movement took an active part in a variety of international campaigns aimed at curbing war preparations and paving the way to disarmament. Mass meetings were held in the Week of Joint Action for Security in Europe sponsored by the WPC from May 4 to 10, 1981. The Week coincided with the 36th anniversary of the victory over fascism in World War II.

Many rallies were initiated by the SPC and other Soviet public organisations as part of the Day of Mass Anti-War Action announced by the World Peace Council. The Action Day was held on June 22, 1981, the 40th anniversary of nazi Germany's attack on the Soviet Union. At meetings, speakers pointed out with grave concern that there were people who had not learned the lessons of history. Meetings were held in the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Tajikistan, Karelia, Chuvashia, the Khabarovsk Territory and elsewhere across the Soviet Union. Some of the local peace committees organised Peace Days and Weeks to mark the date. In the Ukraine, a Peace Week beginning on June 22 has been regularly observed for already seven years under the auspices of the republican and regional peace committees and commissions assisting the Soviet Peace Fund. In 1981, people at more than 20,000 Ukrainian enterprises worked "peace shifts" during the Week. Voluntary unpaid work by young people on Saturday and also performances and concerts were organised in the Yaroslavl Region, with all proceeds going to the Soviet Peace Fund.

The Soviet Peace Committee endeavours to strengthen and expand bilateral and multilateral contacts with public and political organisations, movements, groups and individuals abroad. At present, the Committee maintains contacts of this kind in over 130 countries. It consolidates its ties and develops co-operation with the system of non-governmental organisations, above all the Special Committee of Non-Governmental Organisations on Disarmament in Geneva.

The Week of Action for Disarmament, held from October 24 to 31, 1981 by decision of the United Nations and the World Peace Council, was marked in the Soviet Union by mass rallies and had wide coverage in the mass media. Slogans of struggle against US and NATO

plans of installing new nuclear missiles in Europe and against the decision of the US Administration to start full-scale production of neutron weapons were prominently displayed during the Week.

Consultative conferences of the peace organisations of the socialist countries were held in Moscow in December 1980 and in Budapest in October 1981. The participants discussed the main directions of their joint work in furthering the decisions of the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace. They reaffirmed their unity of views on pivotal international issues and the identity of the aims and tasks of peace champions in their countries.

The Soviet Peace Committee maintains contacts with a number of international public organisations, including the International Peace Bureau, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, World Association of World Federalists, World Campaign for Disarmament, and so on. Though experience shows that our views on some of the international issues are not always entirely the same, these contacts help create an atmosphere of trust and bring home the fact that only joint action by diverse peace forces can secure the common goal of consolidating peace.

Experience shows that broad contacts between public organisations and movements in various countries also help in finding new forms of struggle for peace. The SPC, therefore, pays special attention to bilateral relations with national peace committees. It maintains regular contacts with peace committees in socialist countries and with peace organisations and movements in Britain, France, the FRG, Portugal, Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland, Finland, the United States, Canada, Japan, Australia, India, Syria, Mexico, Argentina, Colombia, Guinea, the Congo, Ethiopia, and many other countries.

Delegations of the Committee, comprising prominent scientists, political analysts, workers and farmers, cultural personalities and representatives of the clergy, visited some 15 countries on various continents in 1980 alone. Specifically, Soviet representatives went to Federal Germany at the invitation of the Bergedorf discussion club, and to Stockholm at the invitation of the Swedish Peace Council that unites 11 organisations. Contacts have expanded with the mass movement in the Netherlands and its centre, the Co-operation Group "Stop the Neutron Bomb, Stop the Nuclear Arms Race". In 1981, contacts continued between Soviet and US public bodies. An SPC delegation paid a return visit to the United States at the invitation of the Amer-

ican Friends Service Committee, and a delegation of the US Peace Committee was received in the USSR. In November 1981, a conference of Soviet and American political and public figures, one more of the series of Dartmouth meetings, was held in Moscow.

Co-operation made further headway between representatives of peace movements of the Arctic areas of Finland, Sweden, Norway and the USSR within the framework of the Nordkalotten Movement. The Nordkalotten 7th Peace Day was held in Norway in June 1981. Under its programme, parliamentarians, trade unionists and delegates of youth movements discussed problems of concern to the population of the region, namely, European security, disarmament and co-operation in the fields of culture, science and education.

On their travels abroad, SPC delegations meet not only with representatives of broad sections of the population and public organisations but also with influential political leaders and members of government. Their members address mass audiences, hold press-conferences and take part in radio and television programmes.

Delegations of national peace committees and related organisations and movements visiting our country come to know more about the Soviet peace movement, discuss the problems of the movement, and meet Soviet and foreign newsmen.

Republican and provincial peace committees in Byelorussia, the Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Latvia, in the cities of Leningrad, Volgograd, Irkutsk, and so on, also carry on a great deal of work with foreign delegations. In 1980 and 1981, they received delegations from Austria, Belgium, Great Britain, the United States, Greece, Iceland, Denmark, the FRG, Sweden, Finland, Vietnam, the GDR, South Yemen, Ghana, Madagascar, Benin, Ethiopia, Guinea, Nicaragua, Argentina, Morocco, Brazil, Venezuela, Colombia, and other countries.

Information is an important area of SPC activity. Its bulletin, *The XX Century and Peace*, put out in Russian, English, French, Spanish and German, tells about the participation of the Soviet people in the world peace movement and reflects Soviet views on current problems related to the preservation and expansion of detente, curbing the arms race and achieving disarmament. The bulletin publishes articles by prominent personalities and carries information about Soviet participation in various international campaigns, about contacts with foreign organisations, about republican, provincial and regional peace committees, and about the Soviet Peace Fund.

In 1980 and 1981, the Committee also issued such publications as *Disarmament in the 1980s*, *China and the Arms Race*, the booklet *The Soviet Peace Committee*, and others.

In the present situation, new and vigorous united actions for peace are needed if we are to frustrate the forces of war and aggression, ward off a nuclear holocaust threatening the nations, help people comprehend the possible consequences of the aggravation of the international situation, and direct their will and efforts to preserving and expanding detente and developing understanding and international co-operation.

THE SOVIET COMMITTEE FOR SOLIDARITY WITH ASIAN AND AFRICAN COUNTRIES

ALEXANDER DZASOKHOV, Cand. Sc. (Hist.)

B. 1934. From 1967 to 1975, Executive Secretary of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, from 1975 to 1978 its Deputy Chairman, and since 1978 First Deputy Chairman. Member of the Bureau of the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament.

In May 1981, the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee (SAASC) celebrated its 25th anniversary. It is a mass organisation, whose activities are closely connected with the national liberation movements of the peoples of the two continents, with their struggle against imperialism, racism, and reaction, and for peace and social progress. Its goal is to co-ordinate the Afro-Asian solidarity movement in the USSR and to promote friendship and solidarity between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the countries of Asia and Africa.

Thousands of people representing all classes and social groups of the multi-national Soviet Union take part in the activities of the Committee. Its members are deputies to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the Supreme Soviets of Union and Autonomous republics, industrial workers, scholars, writers, artists and composers, and party and government personalities. There are 340 members of the Committee in all. The republics of Central Asia and the Transcaucasus, and Kazakhstan have their own republican solidarity committees, and there is a branch of the national committee in the Soviet Far-East sea port of Nakhodka.

The Soviet solidarity committee is a member of the Afro-Asian Peoples Solidarity Organisation (AAPSO). It takes an active part in

its work, and has representatives on the AAPSO Presiding Committee and in the Permanent Secretariat.

The SAASC maintains a broad range of ties with national-democratic parties, liberation organisations, solidarity committees, and democratic movements in almost 90 countries.

Over the past few years, the main attention of the Committee has been centred on the following objectives:

- strengthening and further developing an organic bond between the national liberation movements and socialism, and support for anti-imperialist and democratic forces on the two continents;

- all-round support for the just struggles of the peoples of the Middle East, Southern Africa, and Indochina in their fight against imperialism and reaction;

- support for the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, Southeast Asia, and other regions where there is military and political tension;

- support for the struggle of the developing countries to eliminate all inequality and diktat in international economic relations.

The SAASC actively supports these and other objectives of the anti-imperialist solidarity movement of the peoples of Asia and Africa, taking guidance in the peace-loving foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet government whole-heartedly approved by the Soviet public.

In the past five years alone, some 250 delegations of the Committee visited countries in Asia and Africa, and 350 foreign delegations were received in the Soviet Union on the invitation of the Committee. The strong ties between the Committee and public and political organisations in the countries of Asia and Africa are furthering mutual understanding and friendship between peoples, and help strengthen detente, peace and international co-operation.

For a long time, the countries of Asia and Africa were targets of colonial exploitation, imperialist diktat and blackmail. They require lasting peace for solving their development problems. The practice of US militarist circles to declare the Middle East, Africa, the Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf, and other regions "zones of their vital interests" causes serious concern in the Afro-Asian region. The Soviet people whole-heartedly support the anti-imperialist struggle of the young states.

In 1980 and 1981, delegations of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee participated in the work of a number of major international

forums. A delegation of the SAASC took part in the International Conference Against Imperialist Bases for Security and Co-operation in the Mediterranean, held on the initiative of AAPSO and the Labour Party of Malta in Valletta, the capital of that country, in March 1980. In May and June of the same year, delegates of the Soviet Committee participated in two other AAPSO conferences—the International Conference on Solidarity with the Asian and African Peoples' Struggle for Independence, Security, and Social and Economic Progress (Colombo, Sri Lanka) on the 25th anniversary of the Bandung Conference, and the International Meeting in Solidarity with the People of Afghanistan (Kabul). Other functions in which SAASC took part, include the Emergency International Conference in Solidarity with the Anti-Imperialist Struggle of the Peoples of the Gulf Area, which took place in October 1980 in Nicosia, Cyprus; the International Conference in Solidarity with the Peoples of Indochina held in May 1981 in Hanoi and Phnom Penh; the International Conference of Solidarity with Syria and the Arab people of Palestine held to protest against the intrigues of imperialism and its minions (June 1981, Damascus).

The 13th Session of the AAPSO Council, held in Aden, capital of Democratic Yemen, in March 1981 was a landmark in the drive mobilising the peoples of Asia and Africa for the struggle to avert a world war and in defence of the sovereignty and independence of the young states. A delegation of the Soviet Solidarity Committee led by its Chairman, M. A. Ibragimov, took part in the work of the session, in which representatives of more than a hundred national and international organisations participated. The session manifested the unity and solidarity of the anti-imperialist forces. The message Leonid Brezhnev sent to the participants emphasised: "Only by joint effort can the peace-loving, progressive forces of the world secure solution of the basic international problems, including a just Middle-East settlement, security in the Gulf area, making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace, elimination of the remaining seats of colonialism and racism, and restructuring international economic relations on a basis of equality."

At a meeting of the organising committee for the 13th Session of the AAPSO Council, the governing bodies of the organisation were elected. Nineteen delegates from countries of Asia and Africa were chosen to serve on the secretariat, including a Soviet representative.

A Soviet delegation took part in the 10th Session of the AAPSO Presiding Committee, held during the celebration of the twentieth

anniversary of the non-alignment movement. The agenda of the session, which took place in November 1981 in Kabul, included problems of the struggle against imperialism, for universal disarmament, and for world peace and security.

The journal *Azia i Afrika segodnya* (Asia and Africa Today), published by the SAASC in conjunction with the Institute of Oriental Studies, and the Africa Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, deals with questions of peace and disarmament related to the countries of Asia and Africa. It appears in Russian, English and French.

The SAASC renders material aid to the national liberation movement and a number of Afro-Asian organisations. More than 1,500 students attending higher and specialised secondary educational institutions in the USSR receive SAASC scholarships.

Soviet participants in the Afro-Asian solidarity movement are constantly endeavouring to broaden their contribution to the strengthening of peace and of national independence in Asian and African countries, and to the further consolidation of the active alliance of the national liberation movement with the forces of socialism and democracy all over the world.

THE SOVIET PUGWASH COMMITTEE

MOISEI MARKOV

Physicist, b. 1908. Graduated from Moscow University in 1930, elected corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in 1953, and full member in 1966. Since 1967, has been member of the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences and Academic Secretary of its Department of Nuclear Physics. Has participated in the Pugwash Movement for many years and is member of the Pugwash Council. Since 1975, has been Chairman of the Soviet Pugwash Committee. Is also a member of the Soviet Peace Committee and Deputy Chairman of the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament.

The activity of Soviet scholars within the framework of the Pugwash Movement, as in the past, is conducted in the so-called Workshops studying topical issues related to preserving peace, and in the annual Pugwash conferences under the general heading of Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs.

Since the London Conference "Nuclear Warfare and the Scientist" (1955) and the conference of scientists from ten countries in the Canadian village of Pugwash (1957), which marked the beginning of the international movement of scientists for peace and the prevention of nuclear war, for disarmament and the development of scientific cooperation known as the Pugwash Movement, Soviet scientists have

taken an active part in all Pugwash annual conferences¹ and in most sessions of the Workshops. Soviet scientists present papers at conferences and participate in the discussion of papers by scholars of other countries.

This applies equally to the participation of Soviet representatives in the 30th Pugwash Conference held on August 20-25, 1980 in Breukelen, in the Netherlands. One hundred twenty-five scholars from 43 countries took part in it. The motto of the Conference was: "Our duty as human beings and scientists is clear: we must opt for survival." The main topics discussed by those present were the questions of curbing the arms race, strengthening European security, and promoting détente. A special session of the Conference was devoted to the 25th anniversary of the Russell-Einstein Manifesto, the programme document of the Pugwash Movement. The statement adopted by the Conference emphasises that a serious threat of nuclear war exists and that there is no alternative other than constructive dialogue to remove the threat of a nuclear catastrophe. The position of Soviet scientists was set forth: they called on the West to begin talks with the USSR and the other socialist countries without delay so that their joint efforts, taking mutual interests into account, could be bent to solving the serious problems of curbing the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race.

Lord Noel-Baker, well known since the days of the League of Nations and a veteran fighter for peace, delivered a major address at the plenary session of the Conference. He recalled the final document of the First Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament (1978): "In the past, governments relied for their security on their national armaments. But today, the accumulation of weapons constitutes much more a threat than a protection to the future of mankind. The time has, therefore, come to seek security in Disarmament!" Noel-Baker used a wide range of factual material to illustrate the statement of US President (1953-1961) General Dwight D. Eisenhower: "Rightly viewed, every warship, every airplane, every gun is a theft from those who hunger and are not fed."² The English phy-

¹ Two Pugwash conferences were held in the Soviet Union: the sixth (Nov. and Dec. 1960) in Moscow and the 19th (Oct. 1969) in Sochi.

² Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his final address to the American people, warned of the danger the growing influence of the military-industrial complex held for America.

sicist Joseph Rotblat said that systematic attempts were being made to reconcile the public with the idea of a "limited" nuclear war, and to convince people that its escalation could be avoided. The Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Pugwash Movement, US physicist Bernard T. Feld, said: "What is important is for both sides to practice restraints in new weapons systems, or the upward spiral will continue indefinitely. . . It has rightfully been noted by many of our colleagues—not least those from my own country—that the US bears a heavy burden of responsibility for having originated and pioneered in the introduction of most of the new, destabilising military technologies."

At the plenary session, the Soviet delegation presented a paper entitled, "The Russell-Einstein Manifesto as Seen in 1980". The speaker noted that although the Russell-Einstein Manifesto was published a quarter of a century ago (in July 1955), it sounded as if it has been written today. Though the Manifesto was produced in the days of the cold war, symptoms of a new "chill" in relations between East and West at the beginning of the eighties made many of the propositions of the Manifesto, in particular, its call for talks, the antithesis of confrontation, highly relevant today.

"Most of us are not neutral in feeling, but, as human beings, we have to remember that, if the issues between East and West are to be decided in any manner that can give any possible satisfaction to anybody, whether Communist or anti-Communist, whether Asian or European or American, whether White or Black, then these issues must not be decided by war. We should wish this to be understood both in the East and in the West." And this in fact is the basic goal of the present peaceful initiatives (though expressed in different words) formulated as the final aim of the suggested negotiations: equal security for all parties taking part in the talks on preventing world-wide conflicts and on beginning disarmament.

Other members of the Soviet delegation presented papers in the various Working Groups of the Conference. Thus, Academician E. M. Primakov presented a paper entitled "The Middle East Crisis"; Academician I. M. Frank spoke on "Co-operation among Scientists"; Academician V. A. Engelgardt's topic was "Science, Technology, and Humanism: Their Interconnections and the Problems of the Third World"; Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR V. S. Emelianov talked on "The Non-proliferation of Atomic

Weapons as a Fundamental Step on the Way to Nuclear Disarmament"; Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences V. G. Trukhanovsky dealt with "The Destabilising Situation in the Indian Ocean"; Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences N. T. Fedorenko discussed "The Consequences of the Arms Race and Related Problems", while I. A. Sokolov, Dr. Sc. (Econ.), dealt with "The Most Crucial Problem of the Day".

On the initiative of Professor S. P. Kapitsa, the Soviet Pugwash group tabled the suggestion that a seminar should discuss the topic of "Averting Nuclear War—the Role of the Media". After this suggestion was discussed by the Pugwash Council (consisting of 22 members at the present time, including Soviet Academicians M. A. Markov and O. A. Reutov and Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences V. G. Trukhanovsky), the Austrian Pugwash group undertook to host the seminar. The Federal Chancellor of Austria, Bruno Kreisky, showed an interest in the proceedings. The seminar took place in Bad Deutsch-Altenburg (near Vienna) on October 11-12, 1980. Soviet Professors, V.V. Zagladin and S. P. Kapitsa took part in it. It was the first such seminar involving scholars in the Pugwash Movement and representatives of the mass media. The second gathering on the same subject took place in December 1981 in Geneva. Unfortunately, Western mass media pay little attention to the views of broad public forces on peace and disarmament.

In 1980 and 1981, Soviet representatives took part in four sessions of the Workshop dealing with the critical situation over nuclear arms in Europe. This group was formed as a response to the planned deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. In addition to scientists, military and political experts took part in these sessions, including Italian Senator General Nino Pasti (former Assistant Commander of NATO Nuclear Forces; General (ret.) Wolf Graf von Baudissin (FRG); General (ret.) H. de Bordas (France); Lt. Gen. Tønne Huitfeldt (Norway); former Chief Scientific Adviser to the British Cabinet, Lord Zuckerman; former Minister of Defence of the Netherlands, Dr. R. J. H. Kruisinga, and Soviet military expert General M. A. Milstein and political expert V. M. Falin.

The Pugwash Movement is a non-governmental organisation uniting people of various political convictions. Naturally, heated discussions sometimes spring up in the Workshops in the course of the conferences. But usually, following the principle of the Russell-Einstein

Manifesto cited above, a decision suitable to all the participants is reached. In that sense, the decision of the Executive Committee referred to at the session of the Fourth Pugwash Workshop in May 1981 on such a burning issue as resumption of negotiations on the limitation of strategic arms and nuclear forces in Europe was characteristic, noting that "the Committee is seriously concerned at the present deadlock over a treaty to limit strategic nuclear weapons, and the danger of a renewed nuclear arms race in Europe. . . We stress the urgency for the rapid resumption of negotiations both on strategic arms limitation (SALT) and on the limitation of nuclear forces in Europe. We reaffirm the conclusion of our previous meetings in this series that negotiations would be greatly facilitated by a determination of the parties involved not to take any practical steps during the preparations for negotiations, and during the negotiations themselves, that would increase the present level of nuclear forces in Europe."

In 1980-1981, the Soviet Pugwash group took part in a series of other meetings within the framework of the Pugwash Movement (in particular, the Eighth Session of the Workshop on the questions of chemical warfare, April 1981, Geneva).

Soviet scientists took an active part in the 31st Pugwash Conference held in the town of Banff (Alberta, Canada), on August 28-September 2, 1981. Over 130 prominent scientists from 40 countries gathered for the Conference, and there were a large number of observers. The Soviet delegation included Academicians G. A. Arbatov, O. A. Reutov, and A. V. Fokin; Corresponding Members of the Academy of Sciences V. S. Emelianov, N. A. Plateh, V. G. Trukhanovsky, and N. T. Fedorenko; O. N. Bykov, Dr. Sc. (Hist.) and I. A. Sokolov, Dr. Sc. (Econ.). Within the framework of the Conference, on August 30 in the city of Calgary, an open forum was held on the topic of the Conference, "The Search for Peace in a World in Crisis". The overwhelming majority of participants in the forum, including political figures and scholars from a number of countries expressed concern over the exacerbation of international tensions. Soviet Academician Georgi Arbatov emphasised that the Soviet Union has always been and will be a firm and convinced proponent of peace and of strengthening international security.

There were six Working Groups, which discussed the following problems: avoiding nuclear war, avoiding conventional war, negotiating arms limitation and disarmament, enhancing international security,

energy, resources and international security, and security in the developing world. The Working Group on avoiding nuclear war expressed its deep concern over the fresh intensification of the arms race, and especially the nuclear arms race, a process which had built up force since the conference in Breukelen.

In spite of the divergence of political opinions, the majority of participants in the discussions at the plenary sessions and in the Working Groups presented an objective analysis of the reasons for the worsening of the international situation. The declaration of the Pugwash Council, summarising the results of the Conference on the basis of the papers presented in the Working Groups, contained a series of suggestions aimed at improving the world situation and preventing nuclear war. The suggestions included ratifying SALT-2 without delay and conducting negotiations on the limitation and reduction of strategic and other types of nuclear weapons. The declaration expressed support for the Soviet suggestion on the creation of a committee of authoritative scientists to study the effects of nuclear war and inform the public of their work.

Even before the Banff Conference, the Soviet Pugwash Committee received the following telegram from the President of the Pugwash Movement, Nobel Prize Winner Dorothy Hodgkin and Director General Martin Kaplan: "We greatly appreciate and welcome Leonid Brezhnev's Statement calling for an international committee of prominent scientists to prevent nuclear disaster. This has been the major aim of Pugwash, and we are ready to intensify our efforts in this connection." This message from the leaders of the Pugwash Movement to the Soviet scientists indicates that the suggestion Leonid Brezhnev made at the 26th Congress of the CPSU has won broad support among the world scientific community. The tasks of the proposed committee would be in keeping with the scientists' tradition of social responsibility and with the traditions of the Pugwash Movement.

THE SOVIET PEACE FUND

BORIS POLEVOI

Writer, b. 1908. Deceased Chairman of the Board of the Soviet Peace Fund (1969-1981). Finished the Industrial School in Tver (1926). During the Great Patriotic War of 1941-45 he was a war correspondent for *Pravda*. Polevoi's first novel was published in 1927. His *Story of a Real Man* (1946) was widely acclaimed both at home and abroad. The novel was based on the true feat of pilot Aleksei Maresyev. Polevoi's works have been translated into many languages. Since 1967, he was Secretary of the Board of the Writers' Union of the USSR. He was member of the Bureau of the World Peace Council, member of the Presidium of the Soviet Peace Committee, Vice-President of the European Society of Culture and member of the Bureau of the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament.

Boris Polevoi died in 1981.

It is quite probable that the Soviet people know better than any other the true value of peace. Therefore, when the first World Peace Congress was held in 1949, it drew an enormous response in our country. The Soviet Peace Committee began to receive sums of money, both large and small, sent by individual Soviet citizens or various groups and organisations. Sometimes these gifts bore no signature, but only a short note reading: "For the cause of peace." Thus, the Soviet Peace Fund gained a financial base. In April 1961, at a meeting of representatives of public organisations in Moscow, a decision to establish the Soviet Peace Fund was taken, and an executive board was chosen.

Today, the Fund has become a patriotic, internationalist movement involving millions of people, for Soviet citizens see it as a way for

making a personal contribution to the peace cause by donating money for furthering the efforts of the CPSU and the Soviet government aimed at strengthening peace on earth and averting a new world war. This money is also used to provide assistance to peoples fighting for freedom and independence, as specified in the Charter of the Fund: "Reflecting the patriotism of the Soviet people, guided by the aims and principles of the peace-loving foreign policy of the USSR as entrenched in the Constitution of the USSR, the Soviet Peace Fund will render financial aid to organisations, movements, and individuals engaged in the struggle to strengthen peace, to win national independence and freedom, to develop friendship and co-operation between peoples, to secure a ban on all types of nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction, and to achieve general and complete disarmament."

The Soviet public gave the establishment of the Peace Fund its unreserved approval. At the present time, over 80 million people are contributors to the organisation. In all republics and regions of the country, in cities and villages, at factories and on state and collective farms, and educational institutions, committees have been set up to promote the Fund. These committees have over 4.5 million activists.

Patriotism and internationalism permeate the work of the Fund, which is a manifestation of the great moral strength of our people.

The sympathy and support of the Soviet people have always been on the side of the fighters against imperialism, colonialism, and reaction, and for peace and security.

The Peace Fund has succeeded to the tradition of assisting those who fought for revolution in the twenties and thirties and to the tradition of the Defence Fund which was an outlet for the patriotism of the Soviet people during the Great Patriotic War against Hitler Germany.

In the many letters reaching the Board of the Peace Fund and its republican, regional and local branches, Soviet citizens express ardent support for the peace policy of the CPSU and the Soviet government and make known their attitude toward current events. "The NATO bosses," reads a letter from S. D. Samosyuk, leader of a Komsomol team at industrial transport station No. 5 in Novosibirsk, "are trying to win military superiority over our country with their plans to deploy hundreds of new missiles in Western Europe. At the same time, they are raising a hue and cry over an alleged Soviet threat. Under the circumstances, we common workers cannot just stand idly by with our hands

in our pockets. We feel obliged to do our share to help our Party and Government safeguard peace on earth. The 900 drivers of our enterprise worked a free shift for the Peace Fund, and we are sending you our earnings for that shift—almost 10,000 roubles.”

Donating a day's salary has become a widespread form of contributing to the Fund.

There are similar examples in every republic, region, and territory. It is this involvement in the country's various actions for peace, this deep personal interest of each person in preserving peace and furthering international co-operation that lies at the root of the activity conducted by the Soviet Peace Fund.

The organisations of the Fund take an active part in popularising the peace policy of the USSR and in cultivating internationalism and patriotism among the people. This is done in close contact with the trade unions, the Komsomol, Znaniye (Knowledge) Society, the Soviet Peace Committee, the War Veterans Committee, the Soviet Women's Committee, and the professional unions of artists, writers, composers, and so on.

Here is one example: 98 Komsomol teams in Dnepropetrovsk have named outstanding revolutionaries, personalities in the international communist and workers' movements, heroes of the war and the underground, and others who gave their lives for the happiness of the people as their honorary members. The earnings obtained in the name of these honorary members are sent to the Peace Fund. This form of contribution reminds the youth of the rich revolutionary traditions of our people. At present, in Byelorussia alone there are more than 300 work teams that have adopted honorary members.

Reflecting the will and deep feelings of internationalist solidarity of the Soviet people, the Fund renders a great deal of assistance to the peoples of developing countries struggling for freedom and national independence. In the past few years, the Peace Fund along with the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, the Soviet Peace Committee, and the Soviet Women's Committee have sent manufactured goods and foodstuffs to the People's Republic of Kampuchea and have continued their internationalist support of the Vietnamese people. A campaign For the Children of Vietnam, designed to aid the regions that had suffered from the Chinese aggression, was conducted by the Fund in co-operation with the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries. The Peace Fund has

paid for foodstuffs and medicines sent to the South West African People's Organisation (SWAPO), the African National Congress, and national liberation movements in other regions of the world. The Peace Fund and the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee have co-operated in rendering aid to the population of the southern regions of the Lebanon victimised by Israeli aggression, and help has also been sent to Palestinian refugees. Each year, the Peace Fund makes financial contributions to the Fund of the Organisation of African Unity. Guided by the principles of humanism, the Soviet Peace Fund also sends assistance to those suffering from natural calamities.

The Fund participates in all major public movements working for peace. In particular, it provided funds for the World Conference for a Peaceful and Happy Future for All Children, held in Moscow in 1979. The Fund took part in the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace, a major forum that gathered in Sofia in September 1980, one of the largest in the past few years. It has also participated in a host of other congresses and conferences.

In co-operation with the Council of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies of the USSR, the Fund renders aid to families of victims of reactionary regimes and to political prisoners in Chile and El Salvador.

The Fund finances Soviet public committees and facilitates the development of their ties with progressive national and international organisations in other countries.

The Fund provides funds for research into the problems of peace and disarmament, and for the publications of the Soviet Peace Committee and the journal of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee.

The aid rendered by the Fund is graphic evidence of the Soviet people's internationalist solidarity.

Clothing, foodstuffs, medicines, and children's toys—everything sent by the Fund is bought for the money the Soviet people voluntarily give to it out of their earnings. Many work collectives have decided to work free shifts for peace including voluntary shifts on days off with the proceeds going to the Peace Fund.

The creative intelligentsia of the country responded enthusiastically to an appeal of their Moscow colleagues, who, on September 15, 1972, began a drive to raise money for the Fund. The campaign took the form of benefit concerts, performances, and art auctions whose proceeds were donated to the Fund.

Money earned from inventions and publications at home and abroad are often donated to the Peace Fund. Schoolchildren collect paper waste and scrap metal for recycling, and medicinal herbs, and send the money they earn thereby to the Fund.

The Russian Orthodox Church and other religious organisations and figures make voluntary contributions to the Fund as well.

The Soviet Peace Fund also receives money and gifts from other countries, including France, Britain, and the USA.

But the Peace Fund is more than just a people's "piggy bank": it is an invaluable expression of the goodwill of millions of Soviet citizens and a demonstration of the finest traits of the Soviet people and Soviet way of life.

During the preparations for the 26th Congress of the CPSU and during the Congress itself, the commission which dealt with the Peace Fund and other public organisations took an active part in explaining the goals and tasks of the peaceful foreign policy of the CPSU, emphasising its indissoluble links with the needs and expectations of our people. During the days before the Congress and while it was in session, the flow of donations to the Fund increased sharply. From all corners of the country came news of Peace Days, shifts worked for peace, etc., and monetary contributions.

THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIETIES FOR FRIENDSHIP AND CULTURAL RELATIONS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES

ZINAIDA KRUGLOVA

President of the Board of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, b. 1923. Finished the Leningrad Aeronautics Instrument Engineering Institute (1951). She worked there until 1954, then from 1954 to 1974 was involved in party work. In 1974-1975 she was Deputy Minister of Culture of the USSR. Kruglova is a member of the Central Committee of the CPSU and a deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet. She is also a member of the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament.

The Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries (Friendship Societies) is a mass organisation that promotes mutual relations, friendship, and co-operation between the peoples of the USSR and those of foreign countries. The organisation was founded in 1958 on the basis of the National Society for Cultural Ties with Other Countries which was launched in 1925.

As of the end of 1981, it united 78 associations and friendship societies and 14 republic-level societies, and branches in various cities of the RSFSR (Leningrad, Volgograd, Irkutsk, Khabarovsk, Novosibirsk, Cochi, and Togliatti). The Union also has under its auspices 13 associations and sections of cultural and research workers in various spheres of knowledge, and the Association for Ties Between Soviet and Foreign Cities. It includes over a thousand republican, regional, city, and local departments, and also chapters at about 30,000 enterprises and organisations.

The governing body of the Societies is the National Conference, which elects the Council that provides leadership between conferences.

The executive body of the Societies is the Board, which is chosen by the Council. In April 1981, the Fourth National Conference of the Friendship Societies was held. It noted that the activities of the Societies were graphic proof of the increased role the Soviet public is playing in the struggle to solve major international problems. Since the Third National Conference (1974), 13 new friendship societies were formed, including the USSR-Angola, USSR-Spain, USSR-Laos, and USSR-Ethiopia societies. New branches of the Societies appeared in Soviet republics and cities. Each year about 55,000 major functions are held by the Societies to strengthen links with the peoples of the world.

Relying on the support of the public, the Soviet Friendship Societies maintain ties with 9,000 organisations and many public figures in 141 countries. The basis of these relations is co-operation with the societies, associations, institutes, and leagues of friendship and cultural ties with the USSR operating in 86 countries. There are now about 120 such organisations. Associations and sections of the Soviet Friendship Societies participate in the work of many international organisations: the International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL), the World Federation of Twin Cities (WFTC), the European Society of Culture (ESC), and others.

The friendship movement has become a significant factor in the struggle to improve international relations and to develop mutually beneficial co-operation in the political, economic, and cultural spheres. This is confirmed by the practice of inter-governmental relations, including agreements concluded between the Soviet Union and various foreign states which often contain clauses referring to friendship societies.

The activity of friendship societies is in complete accord with the ideas of international detente. Soviet and foreign friendship societies actively join in the implementation of the provisions of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe which calls on the signatories to recognise and meet "the need for an ever wider knowledge and understanding of the various aspects of life in other participating States". The signatories have pledged to broaden access to information about other countries and to seek new forms of cultural exchange. The work of the Friendship Societies covers many facets of people's lives and contributes to constructive dialogue between people of various social and political persuasions. The logic of co-operation

places the more crucial issues in international affairs at the centre of this dialogue ever more often. The many meetings with colleagues from abroad, devoted to the problems of strengthening inter-governmental relations, to increasing efforts directed at combining military detente with political detente, to curbing the arms race, and achieving disarmament, organised by the Friendship Societies, have gained increasing recognition. The growth of such forms of co-operation is a reflection of the public alarm for the fate of detente. Many important international meetings and discussions have been held under the auspices and with the participation of the Societies and its associations and affiliates in 1979-1981. Among others, this includes the Soviet-French meeting on detente and disarmament in Paris (April 1979); the international colloquium "Arms Limitation and Disarmament—the Central Problem in Maintaining Peace and Security" held in Turtzing, FRG (April 1979), and the May 1980 Soviet-FRG public meeting in Bremen on the tenth anniversary of the Moscow Treaty and the role of the public in furthering Soviet-FRG relations, and the Soviet-FRG public colloquium "The State and the Outlook for Relations between the FRG and the USSR" (Kiev, October 1981). Meetings between representatives of the Soviet and North European public are also fast becoming a tradition. The last such meeting was held in Stockholm in May 1981 and dealt with European security, and creation of a nuclear-free zone in Northern Europe. Soviet-British meetings were held in Moscow on relaxation of international tensions, and Soviet-British relations (October 1980). Then a meeting was held in Edinburgh under the slogan "Conversations on Survival in the Nuclear Age" (October 1981). Soviet-Canadian relations were discussed by both parties in the symposium "Soviet-Canadian Relations and the Role of the Public of Both Countries in the Struggle for Peace and Disarmament" held in Toronto (September 1981). A Soviet-Japanese round-table discussion was devoted to the improvement of Soviet-Japanese relations and consolidating peace and security in the Far East. The first part of the discussion was held in Tokyo (December 1979) and the second part in Moscow (November 1980). Soviet-Indian symposia and seminars included one in Tbilisi on Soviet-Indian Co-operation and Problems of Peace and Security in Asia (November 1980) and a scientific session in Moscow on the Historic Significance of Soviet-Indian Co-operation (September 1981). Two international meetings between representatives of the Soviet public and members of societies

for friendship with the USSR in countries of Tropical Africa (August-September 1979, Moscow and Alma-Ata) and countries of Southern and Southeast Asia (April 1980, Moscow) took a serious look at the matter of building up unity in the struggle against imperialism and for stability and peace in Africa and Asia. There was an international meeting in Hanoi (October 1980) between representatives of the friendship societies of socialist countries to strengthen ties of solidarity with the peoples of Vietnam, Laos, and Kampuchea. Another goal of this meeting was to plan assistance in repulsing the intrigues of foreign interventionists, while consolidating peace in Southeast Asia. Many other colloquia, symposia, and seminars of a similar nature were held during the past few years.

The Association of Soviet Lawyers¹ does fruitful work for peace and disarmament within the framework of the Friendship Societies.

Active defence of detente and peace is an increasingly important facet of the twin cities movement, and the work of the Association for Ties Between Soviet and Foreign Cities co-ordinates links between 140 Soviet cities and 300 cities in 60 capitalist and developing countries. Thus, close bonds of friendship and co-operation have developed between 50 Soviet and 50 Finnish cities, and between 54 cities in the USSR and 54 in France. The 4th Meeting of Representatives of Twin Cities in the USSR and Finland was held in August 1981 in Tampere, Finland. The basic purpose of the meeting was to heighten the role of twin cities in the struggle for international co-operation, detente and peace. The main topic of the meeting of representatives of Soviet and French twin cities, held in October 1981 in Aix-le-Bene in Savoy was that of French-Soviet twin cities as a factor of mutual acquaintance with life in the other country, bilateral co-operation, and detente. Working toward the goal of detente, the delegates of Soviet cities took part in the 10th World Congress of Twin Cities in November 1981 in Casablanca, Morocco.

Heightening the role of scientists and cultural figures in mobilising public opinion against the dangers of nuclear war is the aim of the professional associations and sections of the Friendship Societies.

Developments on the international scene draw an increasing number of people all over the world into the struggle for peace and for strengthening friendship with the Soviet Union.

¹ See the article "Association of Soviet Lawyers" in this book.

This is reflected more and more in the practical activity of all societies for friendship with the USSR. This trend is particularly noticeable in countries of Western Europe, where the friendship societies come out in active support of the broad public movement directed against the neutron bomb and the deployment of US medium-range nuclear missiles on the European continent. These same forces increasingly favour peaceful coexistence and detente.

The foreign public met with approval the results of the 26th Congress of the CPSU and the programme for solving the urgent problems of our time advanced in Leonid Brezhnev's speech at the Congress. The programme is in full accord with the hope of the peoples for lasting peace. The most important task of the Soviet Friendship Societies is to popularise the new proposals contained in that programme to improve the international situation. It takes an active part in mobilising public opinion in the struggle for the practical realisation of these proposals and is intensifying its efforts in building up the world where people live in the spirit of friendship and good-neighbourliness.

MATERIALS AND DOCUMENTS

Concise Bibliography

Chronicle of Events

Chronicle of Meetings and Conferences

To the Parliaments and Peoples of the World

Peace and Disarmament Instruments

**Basic Documents of Important Public
Peace Forums**

CONCISE BIBLIOGRAPHY ON QUESTIONS OF PEACE AND DISARMAMENT¹

WORKS BY CPSU AND SOVIET GOVERNMENT LEADERS

BREZHNEV L. I., *Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the XXVI Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy, February 23, 1981*, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1981.

TIKHONOV N. A., *Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1981-1985 and for the Period Ending in 1990*, Report of Comrade N. A. Tikhonov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, to the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, February 27, 1981, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1981.

PONOMAREV B. N., *The Living and Effective Teaching of Marxism-Leninism. A Reply to Critics*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1979.

БРЕЖНЕВ Л. И. «Генеральный секретарь ЦК КПСС, Председатель Президиума Верховного Совета СССР товарищ Л. И. Брежнев о Китае (ноябрь 1964—сентябрь 1979)»: Сборник. М.: Б. и., 1980, 54 с.

БРЕЖНЕВ Л. И. «Избранные произведения». В 3-х томах. М.: Политиздат, 1981. Т. 1. 1964—1970. 543 с. Т. 2. 1971—1975. 511 с. Т. 3. 1976—март 1981. 623 с.

¹ Works published in 1980 and 1981. For works by CPSU and Soviet government leaders on peace and disarmament published in 1976 to 1979 and in early 1980, see *Peace and Disarmament. Academic Studies, 1980*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1980.

- БРЕЖНЕВ Л. И. «Ленинским курсом: Речи, приветствия, статьи». М.: Политиздат, 1981. Т. 8. 800 с.
- БРЕЖНЕВ Л. И. «На страже мира и социализма». 2-е изд., доп. М.: Политиздат, 1981. 815 с.
- БРЕЖНЕВ Л. И. «О Ленине и ленинизме». М.: Политиздат, 1981. 336 с.
- БРЕЖНЕВ Л. И. «Об интернационализме и дружбе народов». М.: Политиздат, 1981. 704 с.
- БРЕЖНЕВ Л. И. Ответы на вопросы редакции журнала «Шпигель» (ФРГ). М.: Политиздат, 1981. 31 с.
- БРЕЖНЕВ Л. И. «Советские профсоюзы в условиях развитого социализма». 2-е изд., доп. М.: Политиздат, 1981. 623 с.
- ГРОМЫКО А. А. «Обеспечить мир народам — задача всех государств: Выступление на XXXV сессии Генеральной Ассамблеи ООН, 23 сентября 1980 г.». М.: Политиздат, 1980. 47 с.
- ГРОМЫКО А. А. «Во имя обеспечения мира — общего достояния человечества: Выступление на XXXVI сессии Генеральной Ассамблеи ООН, 22 сентября 1981 г.». М.: Политиздат, 1981. 31 с.
- КИРИЛЕНКО А. П. «Политика созидания и мира: Избранные речи и статьи». М.: Политиздат, 1980. 759 с.
- КУНАЕВ Д. А. «Ленинская национальная политика КПСС — в действии. Избранные речи и статьи». М.: Политиздат, 1981, 624 с.
- РОМАНОВ Г. В. «Избранные речи и статьи». М.: Политиздат, 1980. 616 с.

СУСЛОВ М. А. «Марксизм-ленинизм и современная эпоха». 2-е изд., доп. М.: Политиздат, 1980. 198 с.

ТИХОНОВ Н. А. «Избранные речи и статьи». М.: Политиздат, 1980. 448 с.

ТИХОНОВ Н. А. «По Ленинским заветам, по пути Октября: Доклад на торжественном заседании, посвященном 63-й годовщине Великой Октябрьской социалистической революции, в Кремлевском Дворце Съездов, 6 ноября 1980 г.». М.: Политиздат, 1980. 32 с.

УСТИНОВ Д. Ф. «Под знаменем Великого Октября: Доклад на торжественном заседании, посвященном 64-й годовщине Великой Октябрьской социалистической революции, в Кремлевском Дворце Съездов, 6 ноября 1981 г.» М.: Политиздат, 1981. 32 с.

ЧЕРНЕНКО К. У. «Избранные речи и статьи». М.: Политиздат, 1981. 679 с.

ПОНОМАРЕВ Б. Н. «Великая жизненная сила ленинизма: Доклад на торжественном заседании в Москве, посвященном 110-й годовщине со дня рождения В. И. Ленина, 21 апреля 1980 г.». М.: Политиздат, 1980. 32 с.

ПОНОМАРЕВ Б. Н. «Под знаменем Ленина — за мир и социализм. Избранные произведения». М.: Наука, 1981. Т. 1. 416 с.

РАШИДОВ Ш. Р. «60-летие Великого Октября и торжество пролетарского интернационализма в СССР: Доклад на Всероссийской научно-теоретической конференции 13 апреля 1977 г.». Ташкент: Изд-во ЦК КП Узбекистана, 1980. 41 с.

WORKS BY OTHER AUTHORS PUBLISHED IN THE SOVIET UNION IN 1980-1981¹

Meeting of European Communist and Workers' Parties for Peace and Disarmament, Paris, 28-29 April 1980, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1980.

The book contains the following documents: communique, speeches of the leaders of delegations of 22 European communist and workers' parties and the Appeal of the Communists to the Peoples of the European Countries for Peace and Disarmament. The Appeal outlines ways for averting the danger of war and consolidating detente, and specifies measures to be taken to this end by the communist and workers' parties. The collection closes with the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee On the Results of the Paris Meeting of European Communist and Workers' Parties. The Central Committee approved the report of the CPSU delegation to the meeting, and gave its support to the initiatives advanced in the Appeal. It expressed the desire of the CPSU to co-operate on the basis of these initiatives with all European communist and workers' parties, and all other political parties and organisations in the name of peace and disarmament.

АБРАСИМОВ П. А. «Западный Берлин: вчера и сегодня». М.: Международные отношения, 1980. 216 с.

The author, Ambassador of the USSR to the GDR, examines the stand of the USSR, the USA, Britain, and France on the West Berlin issue and shows the mechanism and procedure of the talks that led to the conclusion of the quadripartite agreement in 1971. He cites a large number of documents. The reader learns what had been done by the Soviet Union, the GDR and other countries of the socialist community to bring about the settlement of the West Berlin issue and to expedite the sign-

¹ For works published in the Soviet Union in 1978 and 1979 and in early 1980, see *Peace and Disarmament. Academic Studies*, 1980, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1980.

ing and implementation of the quadripartite agreement. The author also examines the present-day situation in West Berlin, and calls attention to the consistent efforts of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to further the implementation of the quadripartite agreement, which has had a favourable influence on the political climate in Europe.

БЕЛАЩЕНКО Т. К. «Форпосты Пентагона». М.: Воениздат, 1980. 127 с.

In his analysis of the US "base strategy" doctrine, the author, who involves a wealth of facts, discusses the ways employed by US and NATO opponents of detente to aggravate the international situation and prepare war against the USSR and other socialist states. The author shows how the Pentagon network of military bases and bridgeheads in foreign countries, and US military contingents and naval forces overseas serve the aims of US foreign policy. He describes the uses of military bases for subversive propaganda and espionage against the USSR, economic enslavement of other countries, and US interference in the domestic affairs of "friendly states". This line, the author warns, endangers international peace and security.

БОВИН А. Е. «Мир семидесятых: Политические очерки». М.: Известия, 1980. 336 с.

Articles published in Soviet national newspapers by A. E. Bovin, a well-known political analyst, are compiled in this book to produce an overall picture of the complex and controversial political atmosphere of the 1970s. The author discusses Soviet-American relations, the progressive forces' fight for peace and disarmament, the situation in China, the prospects of the non-aligned movement, the energy crisis, inter-state relations in Western Europe, the Iranian revolution and the Camp David deal, democratic trends in Spain, and detente in Europe, etc. The topicality of the issues examined in the book, wide use of documents and reference material, and the in-depth view of developments in different parts of the world are sure to capture the readers' interest.

«Варшавский Договор — союз во имя мира и социализма». (Под общ. ред. В. Г. Куликова.) М.: Воениздат, 1980. 295 с.

The goals, nature and history of the Warsaw Treaty are discussed by a group of authors of the General Staff of the joint armed forces of the Treaty countries and the Institute of Military History of the USSR Ministry of Defence. The book contains an analysis of the objective factors making for the close military and political unity of the Warsaw Treaty countries, and an examination of the forms and methods of their political, economic and military co-operation within the framework of the Treaty. The book also deals with the development of the national armies of member-countries, and demonstrates the tremendous contribution of the defensive alliance of the socialist states to the maintenance and consolidation of peace, the fight for disarmament and detente.

«В интересах народов мира: Внешнеполитическая программа XXV съезда КПСС в действии.» (Под ред. А. Л. Нарочницкого.) М.: Международные отношения, 1980. 376 с.

This joint monograph prepared under the auspices of the Scientific Council of the USSR Academy of Sciences on the History of Soviet Foreign Policy and International Relations examines the major lines followed by Soviet diplomacy in carrying out the foreign-policy programme of the 25th Congress of the CPSU. The authors show the growing Soviet co-operation with the socialist and developing countries, Soviet relations with the capitalist states, and Soviet efforts against the arms race and for disarmament. Special chapters are devoted to the questions of peace and security in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America, and to the role of the UN.

The authors criticise the views of the foes of detente and disarmament.

ВЛАСЬЕВИЧ Ю. Е. «Экономическое бремя милитаризма». М.: Мысль, 1980. 183 с.

Author Y. E. Vlasievich shows the pernicious effects for society of militarism and the arms race. He examines the economic consequences of the two world wars and of the imperialist-inspired arms race, analyses the causes of the growing harm of the military spending for the economy, and the methods used by leading capitalist states to make up for them. The arms race is dangerous and burdensome, aggravates international tensions and adds to the threat of a world nuclear war. The author criticises the attempts of certain Western sociologists to justify the arms race, and demonstrates the necessity and economic benefits of disarmament.

ВЛАДИМИРОВ С., ТЕПЛОВ Л. «Курсом хельсинкских договоренностей». М.: Международные отношения, 1980. 224 с.

Authors Vladimirov and Teplov discuss the peace initiatives of the socialist countries in support of the accords reached in Helsinki in 1975. They examine the proposals designed to extend detente to the military sphere and trace the practical steps furthering detente in the economic field. They show the subversive activities of the opponents of detente running counter to the Helsinki accords, and the growing role that progressives play in the fight for security and co-operation in Europe.

«Военно-блоковая политика империализма: История и современность» (Под ред. П. А. Жилина, Р. Брюля (ГДР)). М.: Воениздат, 1980. 454 с.

Prepared by historians of the USSR and the GDR, this monograph discusses the bloc-making policy of imperialism and its evolution in the past sixty years. Using a wealth of facts, its authors show how at different periods that policy was adjusted to the changes in the international situation and in the foreign and home policy of the major imperialist states and to their economy, military doctrines and strategy. Also examined are the salient features of bloc-making policy today, the centrifugal and centripetal trends in NATO, SEATO, SENTO and ANZUS,

and the activities of these alliances in the escalation of the arms race and for inhibiting disarmament. The book shows the struggle of the peace forces against the imperialist bloc-making policy, and the importance of the proposals of the USSR and the other socialist countries designed to relieve and eliminate blocs and ensure international security.

«Вопросы советской внешнеполитической пропаганды»
(Под ред. Ш. П. Санакоева.) М.: Международные отношения, 1980. 256 с.

The monograph deals with the pattern of Soviet propaganda, which rests on the principles worked out by Lenin. The authors show how the pattern developed and identify its main goal—to promote international co-operation in the interests of world peace and security. They also examine the mechanism of Soviet propaganda and the co-ordination of effort by the mass media of the socialist countries against the ideological subversion by those who oppose normalisation of inter-state relations on the principles of peaceful coexistence.

«Глобальные проблемы современности» (Отв. ред.
Н. Н. Иноземцев.) М.: Мысль, 1981. 285 с.

Invoking a wealth of facts and wide-ranging historical material, this comprehensive study analyses the root causes, essence and manner of solving today's global problems. Pride of place is given to the key problem of the modern world—that of averting the danger of thermonuclear war, which is the clue to preserving human civilisation and solving all other problems bedevilling mankind. The authors also discuss economic progress in developing countries, the demographic situation, famine and malnutrition, raw materials and energy supplies, the resources of the World Ocean and their use, development of outer space, and the international aspects of the interaction of society and nature. The book contains a critical study of certain futurological theories and the approaches of Western scientists to problems common to all mankind.

ГОРБАТОВ О. М., ЧЕРКАССКИЙ Л. Я. «Борьба СССР за обеспечение прочного и справедливого мира на Ближнем Востоке: 1967—1980 гг.» М.: Наука, 1980. 280 с.

The authors, Gorbatov and Cherkassky, recapitulate the Soviet efforts to secure a settlement of the Middle East conflict: they show the support rendered by the USSR to the just struggle of the Arab peoples against the aftermaths of Israeli aggression, its moves for an early convocation of a special world conference on the Middle East and for the restoration of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine. They also discuss the Soviet attitude to the separatist Camp David deal, and stress the importance of a Middle East settlement for international détente.

ДАВЫДОВ В. Ф. «Нераспространение ядерного оружия и политика США». М.: Наука, 1980. 278 с.

The monograph discusses nuclear non-proliferation, one of the most topical issues of today. The author tackles various aspects of the problem and shows how the US approach evolutionised from the MacMahon Act of 1946 to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968. The book examines the rivalry of the USA and the West European countries in the atomic market, US relations with developing countries in the field of atomic energy, the appearance of "near nuclear" states and their policy and potential as assessed by US experts. The author draws attention to the contradictions in the US approach to nuclear non-proliferation and to the Soviet proposals for strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation regime.

«Дипломатия стран социализма» (В. Н. Белецкий, О. Б. Борисов, В. Л. Израэлян и др. Под общ. ред. А. А. Громыко.) М.: Международные отношения, 1980. 431 с.

A group of authors of the Diplomatic Academy of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs discusses the theoretical basis of the Leninist principles of socialist diplomacy and their application by diplomats of the socialist countries in the drive for world peace and security.

In the foreword, Andrei Gromyko, Member of the CPSU Central Committee Political Bureau and USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs, speaks of the tremendous contribution of the foreign policy and diplomacy of the socialist states to the fight for lasting peace and disarmament. The book examines the many-sided effort of socialist diplomacy to promote security and co-operation in Europe and Asia and to restructure international economic relations on a just and mutually advantageous basis. A special chapter deals with socialist diplomacy in the UN.

ДОРОФЕЕВ Б. Я. «Трудовая Австралия в борьбе за мир и социальный прогресс». М.: Международные отношения, 1980. 214 с.

The author focusses his attention on the political and economic situation in Australia and the struggle of the working people for their vital interests. He also examines the problems and difficulties of the anti-war movement and the campaign of peace advocates against the participation of Australian troops in the Vietnam war. The book traces the development of the peace movement into a nation-wide force.

ЕМЕЛЬЯНОВ В. С. «Проблемы нераспространения ядерного оружия». М.: Наука, 1981. 90 с.

V. S. Emelyanov, a prominent Soviet scholar and participant in various international talks on nuclear non-proliferation, discusses the versatile and consistent Soviet search of constructive solution to the nuclear non-proliferation problem. He shows the difficulties that arose when the Non-Proliferation Treaty was being drafted and examines the problem as it stands today. The author invokes facts to show that certain quarters are obstructing efforts to strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime, and discusses the relation between peaceful uses of atomic energy and nuclear non-proliferation, the chances of nuclear weapons appearing in the arsenals of states that do not have any now, and the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency and its system of guarantees.

ЕРШОВА Е. Н. «Движение за мир, против милитаризма и войны в США (1965—1978)». М.: Наука, 1980. 221 с.

Using extensive factual material, the author shows the birth of anti-war sentiments in the USA following the American armed intervention in Southeast Asia. She traces the development of the anti-war movement, the periods of its vitalisation and decline, and shows the influence on it of the situation at home and abroad. The book discusses the political, social and ideological aspects of the peace movement in the USA, its aims and tasks, the various trends within the movement and the forms of struggle used by US peace fighters: the establishment of public anti-war organisations, demonstrations, conferences, strikes, anti-draft campaigns, etc. The author emphasises the US peace fighters' drive for a massive and united movement for detente and international security, and against the arms race.

ЕФРЕМОВ А. Е. «Опасный бизнес торговцев смертью: Гонка вооружений и ее последствия». М.: Политиздат, 1981. 176 с.

The author discusses the dangers of the militarist policies of the ruling element in the USA, the other NATO countries and China, escalating the arms race and using armed force in international relations. The military-industrial complex of the imperialist countries, the author shows, plays a sinister role in stoking up international tensions and augmenting the danger of another world war. The author demonstrates the futility of US and NATO attempts to gain military superiority over the USSR and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation. He shows to what ends the money released as a result of the limitation of armaments and reduction of military expenditures could be used. He stresses the paramount importance of public action in furthering detente, and curbing and ending the arms race.

ЗАГЛАДИН В. В., ФРОЛОВ И. Т. «Глобальные проблемы современности: научный и социальный аспекты». М.: Международные отношения, 1981. 240 с.

The authors, Zagladin and Frolov, consider the major global problems of today—consolidation of peace, overcoming backwardness and securing economic growth, population growth, raw materials and energy, environmental protection, and so on.

The authors exhaustively define the criteria of globality and reveal their essence and specificities. They show that solution of global problems, particularly that of averting world nuclear holocaust, is the condition for and part of any further social development. Special attention is devoted to the relation between the social and scientific aspects of the efforts to solve global problems.

«За материализацию разрядки» (Под ред. В. А. Брыкина. Предисловие Н. С. Патоличева.) М.: Международные отношения, 1980. 301 с.

In this book, prefaced by Nikolai Patolichev, USSR Minister of Foreign Trade, prominent Soviet economists and foreign trade experts discuss detente and its prospects in the field of economic relations between the USSR and developed capitalist countries. The authors show what the socialist countries are doing to put international economic relations on a just and democratic foundation and how closely this restructuring is related to the limitation of the arms race, to disarmament and detente. The legal aspects of economic co-operation, co-operation in environmental protection, power engineering and transport, and expansion of co-operation between CMEA and EEC, are considered.

ИОЙРЫШ А. И., МОРОХОВ И. Д., ИВАНОВ С. К. «А-бомба». М.: Наука, 1980. 422 с. В надзаг.: АН СССР, Ин-т государства и права. Отв. редактор вице-президент АН СССР академик Е. П. Велихов.

This historical essay is devoted to the scientific and practical aspects of the development of atomic weapons in the USA and the USSR in entirely different conditions. The authors examine the military and political motives behind the atomic tragedy of Hiroshima, which has become a tragedy for all mankind. The book touches on the events in the early period of the nuclear era,

and speaks of a large number of statesmen and nuclear scientists, Roosevelt, Churchill, Einstein, Bohr, Heisenberg, Weizsacker, Curie, Fermi, Teller, Oppenheimer, Yoffe and Kurchatov, and of their contribution, discoveries and doubts, characters and responsibility for the future of the world. The authors show US-British rivalry in developing nuclear weapons and concerted efforts to blackmail the Soviet Union. This thought-provoking book suggests that US militarist policy is fraught with danger for all mankind and that the peoples must rally against the nuclear threat to international peace and security.

ИСРАЭЛЯН В. Л. «Организация Объединенных Наций и разоружение». М.: Международные отношения, 1981. 232 с.

The author speaks of what the UN is doing to halt the arms race and bring about nuclear disarmament, reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces, and regional disarmament measures. He analyses the mechanism of the disarmament talks at the present stage.

The initiatives of the USSR, the other socialist countries and of the non-aligned states, the author holds, are of great help in solving the topical issues of disarmament and raising the prestige and efficiency of the UN in buttressing international peace and security.

«История антивоенного движения в капиталистических странах Европы: 1945—1976 гг.» (Редколлегия: И. И. Жигалов (отв. ред.), З. Я. Мирский, Н. Д. Смирнова.) М.: Наука, 1981. 406 с.

This book is a joint study of the anti-war movement and the forms it takes in West European countries, such as Britain, France, the FRG, Italy, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Greece, Austria and the Benelux states. The authors concentrate on the social roots of the movement, the specific features in different regions and countries, and the main political forces. They praise the support rendered to the anti-war forces by communist and workers' parties and the World Peace Movement. Questions per-

taining to anti-militarist activities of trade-union, youth, women's and religious organisations are discussed at length. The book traces events to 1974-1976. The Conclusion contains a brief review of the major events of the anti-war movement from 1975 to 1980.

«История внешней политики СССР, 1917—1980». В 2 томах. (Под ред. А. А. Громыко, Б. Н. Пономарева. 4-е изд., переработанное и дополненное.) М.: Наука, 1980—1981 гг. Том первый: 1917—1945. 511 с. Том второй: 1945—1980. 757 с.

This is a new edition of a capital work by prominent Soviet party leaders, statesmen, historians, and diplomats, a serious contribution to the history of Soviet activity on the international scene. Chronological presentation of events is organically combined with theoretical analysis of major international problems. The book shows the unswerving dedication of Soviet foreign policy to the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, to strengthening international security, strict observance of treaties and obligations, and adherence to the principles of international law.

Particular emphasis is laid on the Soviet Union's efforts to implement the provisions of the Peace Programme, adopted by the 24th Congress of the CPSU, and the Programme of Further Struggle for Peace and International Co-operation, and for the Freedom and Independence of the Peoples, adopted by the 25th Congress of the CPSU.

КОЗЫРЕВ А. В. «Нет! — 'торговле смертью'». М.: Международные отношения, 1980. 100 с.

This is an examination of the militaristic tendencies prevalent in the policy of the USA and its allies, showing the real motivations behind the arms trade of the USA, France, Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and Israel: their use of the arms trade to obtain profits, to establish and maintain their imperialist domination in some countries and to draw them into the orbit of imperialist foreign policy. The author shows the firm and principled stand of the USSR on limiting international trade in arms and arms supplies.

КОКОШИН А. А. «США: за фасадом глобальной политики. (Внутренние факторы формирования внешней политики американского империализма на пороге 80-х годов)» М., Политиздат, 1981. 367 с.

A. A. Kokoshin analyses the principal objective and subjective international factors behind the shaping and realisation of US foreign policy. Studies the influence of international developments on the internal situation in the USA, and chiefly the impact of social, economic, and ideological developments in the country on US foreign policy, the causes for the inconsistency and contradictory nature of the policy of the Carter Administration (1977-1981), and the struggle within the ruling circles over the problem of "national priorities", as well as the conflict of monopoly groupings and various forces within the Administration, primarily in Congress, over the tenor of Washington's policy on the international scene.

КОТЛЯРОВ И. И. «Международный контроль с использованием космических средств: международно-правовые вопросы». М.: Международные отношения. 1981. 119 с.

I. I. Kotlyarov shows the role of monitoring the observance by states of international commitments in assuring their fulfilment. Describes the forms and methods of monitoring disarmament agreements and environmental protection measures.

The main attention is devoted to the legal aspects of international monitoring by space techniques, in particular in connection with SALT-1 and SALT-2.

Examining proposals for the establishment of a special body for international disarmament monitoring by space techniques, in particular the Memorandum of the French Government (1978) concerning an international agency of monitoring satellites, the author notes that the creation of special bodies for implementing international control activities must not precede the agreements whose provisions are subject to verification. He notes that space monitoring, though national in origin, is in aim and purpose a form of international monitoring.

ЛАВРЕНТЬЕВ А. К. «США: силовая дипломатия в Азии». М.: Международные отношения, 1980. 270 с. (Империализм: события, факты, документы)

The book analyses expansionist US policies on the Asian continent. It covers an extensive historical period to show the various methods employed by US diplomacy to further US interests in Asia, such as forming aggressive blocs, secretly supporting rebel groups opposing lawful governments, fanning religious conflicts, setting some Asian countries against others, stirring local conflicts, etc. Special attention is devoted to analysis of US aggressive actions against the socialist countries of Indochina, and also nations of Southwest Asia, and to the Asian countries' growing resistance to US expansionism.

ЛЕБЕДЕВ Н. И. «СССР в мировой политике: 1917—1980». М.: Международные отношения, 1980. 360 с.

N. I. Lebedev draws on vast historical material to show the emergence and development of Soviet foreign policy and to demonstrate its outstanding contribution to the solution of major world problems in the twentieth century. He notes the continuity of aims and tasks in the Soviet Union's struggle to consolidate peace and international security, and to restructure the system of international relations on a just and democratic basis. Special attention is devoted to the present stage of this struggle and the specific development of the system of international relations over the past decade. The book analyses the process of detente and examines its nature and beneficial effects for all countries and peoples, showing the significance of Soviet-American relations. Criticises the attempts of the opponents of detente to hinder normalisation of international relations.

ЛЕВИН Д. Б. «Международное право, внешняя политика и дипломатия». М.: Международные отношения, 1981. 142 с.

D. B. Levin considers the relationship between international law, foreign policy and diplomacy in the context of international relations today. Considerable attention is devoted to a critique

of the theories of leading Western jurists specialising in international law. Emphasis is laid on the role of public opinion in the struggle for peace and disarmament as a new positive factor of international relations. Levin stresses the contribution of Soviet foreign policy to the progressive development of international law and the practical realisation of the principles of peaceful coexistence, non-use of force in international relations, etc., and shows the significance of the fact that these principles of international law are entrenched in Soviet foreign policy as constitutional principles.

«Международное право на службе мира и сотрудничества государств». Отв. ред.: В. Копал (ЧССР), Н. А. Ушаков (СССР). М.: Международные отношения, 1981, 176 с.

A joint work by researchers of the Institute of the State and Law of the USSR Academy of Sciences and the Institute of the State and Law of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences considers the progressive development of international law in recent years as a result of the activities of socialist countries and other peace forces. Describes the legal aspects of the major issues of today: disarmament, non-interference in internal affairs, non-use of force in international relations, co-operation among states, human rights, inviolability of state frontiers, struggle to abolish racist and colonialist regimes. Notes the contribution made by the international law experts of socialist countries to the study of problems related to the strengthening of international law and order and to the struggle for the further improvement of international law as an effective instrument of strengthening international peace and security.

«Международный ежегодник. Политика и экономика». Выпуски 1980 и 1981 гг. (Гл. ред. О. Н. Быков.) М.: Политиздат, 1980. 270 с. 1981. 319 с. В надзаг.: АН СССР. Ин-т мировой экономики и международных отношений.

The 23rd and 24th issues of the *Mezhdunarodny yezhegodnik* (*International Yearbook*), compiled, like the preceding ones, on the thematic principle describe events that took place on the international scene and in individual countries in 1979 and 1980, respectively. Each volume consists of four sections, the first three mostly dealing with the economic, political and social development of all socialist, major capitalist and many developing states. Also included are articles on the most important problems and events on the regional and global level. The final section contains accounts of major international conferences and organisations, and a chronicle of major international events.

Facts, important events and long-term trends in various fields of world development are analysed. Attention is focussed on problems associated with the struggle for consolidating peace and limiting and reducing armaments. The confrontation between forces supporting detente and its adversaries is described. The activities of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance are shown and the deepening economic and socio-political contradictions in the capitalist world are analysed. Special attention is devoted to regional conflicts and "flashpoints".

Peace and Disarmament. Academic Studies. 1980. Ed. by N. N. Inozemtsev, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1980, 376 pp.

This is the first of a series of fundamental publications by the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament, set up in 1979 by the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences jointly with the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology and the Presidium of the Soviet Peace Committee. Each book in the series is written on a special subject. Published in five languages (Russian, English, French, German and Spanish). The book contains articles by Soviet scholars specialising in various fields of knowledge, responsible party and government workers, and public figures, who dwell on various aspects of the problem of maintaining and consolidating peace, easing international tensions, and starting disarmament. The authors consider questions bearing on the international co-operation of scientists in the interest of peace, the impact of scientific and technological progress on the preservation of peace, and the use of outer

space for the benefit of peace and progress on Earth. Includes extensive reference material, comprising a review of the peace and disarmament studies made by scientific institutions of the USSR Academy of Sciences, an annotated bibliography, a chronicle of international events, a chronicle of scientific meetings and conferences, and the texts of major documents on peace and disarmament signed by the USSR in 1978-1980.

МОСКВИН Л. Б. «Разрядка и социальный прогресс». М.: Наука, 1980. 191 с.

L. B. Moskvina describes positive changes that occurred on the international scene in the seventies in the political, socio-economic and military spheres. Lists among the fruits of detente the strengthening of peace and confidence among peoples, expansion of mutually advantageous economic, scientific, technical and cultural ties, and conclusion of several international agreements limiting the arms race in some fields. This furthered social progress in all countries.

The work contains criticism of Western forces that want to undermine detente and destroy its fruits, imposing a new round of the arms race on mankind and thus hindering social progress.

«О проблемах разоружения» (Отв. ред. Г. М. Корниенко.) М.: Международные отношения, 1980. 270 с.

The ten articles in the collection by prominent Soviet diplomats and international affairs experts, study the intricate problem of curbing the arms race. The authors show the tremendous damage done by the arms race to each country and the world community as a whole. They show the importance of Soviet political initiatives aimed at stopping the arms race and examine the important problems of prohibiting nuclear weapons tests, ensuring non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, guaranteeing the security of non-nuclear states, limiting strategic arms, ending production of nuclear weapons and destroying their stocks, prohibiting the production of new types of mass destruction weapons, and reducing armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. They characterise the economic and social consequences

of the arms race and the place disarmament holds among the global problems of today.

«ООН как инструмент по поддержанию и укреплению мира: Международно-правовые проблемы» (Ред. колл.: М. М. Аваков, В. Л. Исраэлян и Э. Е. Обминский.) М.: Международные отношения, 1980. 261 с.

This book studies the UN role in strengthening peace and international security. Focusses on raising the effectiveness of UN efforts in solving the acute issues of today, such as disarmament, abolition of colonialism and non-equitable economic relations, and activities in outer space. Discusses the role of UN in the progressive development of international law. It shows the contribution made by the Soviet Union, other countries of the socialist community, and the developing countries to UN activity aimed at preventing a world war and strengthening peace and the security of nations.

«Организация Варшавского Договора: Документы и материалы 1955—1980» (Отв. ред. В. Ф. Мальцев.) М.: Политиздат, 1980. 296 с.

The collection, compiled by officials of the USSR Foreign Ministry and foreign ministries of other Warsaw Treaty member-states, was published on the 25th anniversary of the Treaty. It includes declarations, statements, and communiques of the WTO Political Consultative Committee and communiques and reports of the WTO Committee of Foreign Ministers and Committee of Defence Ministers, and other important documents and materials dating from 1955 to 1980. The documents are arranged chronologically according to the date of signing, adoption or publication. They show the role of the Warsaw Treaty as an effective instrument for the socialist states' joint elaboration of their foreign policy strategy, and demonstrate the great efforts made by the Warsaw Treaty countries to eliminate the war threat in Europe, strengthen peace, deepen political and military detente, and promote all-round peaceful co-operation among states.

«Организация Объединенных Наций: Краткий справочник»
(Сост. В. А. Игнатов, А. А. Титаренко. Отв. ред.
В. Ф. Петровский.) 3-е изд., перераб. и доп. — М.:
Международные отношения, 1980. 143 с.

This publication contains basic facts referring to the formation of the UN, its purposes and principles, and its Charter and structure. It considers functions and powers of the UN General Assembly, its permanent and ad hoc agencies, particularly the new commissions and committees, and also the functions and powers of the Security Council, the Trusteeship Council, the International Court, the Secretariat, and the specialised agencies. The Appendix includes a diagram of UN structure, a list of UN members and Security Council members, and a chronology of General Assembly sessions.

«Организация Объединенных Наций: Сб. документов»
М.: Наука, Главная редакция восточной литературы,
1981. 647 с.

This collection includes the UN Charter, the status of the International Court, and documents reflecting the UN structure and regulating the activity of its main agencies. Special attention is devoted to documents reflecting Soviet efforts in the UN to assure international peace, security and disarmament. Considerable space is given to UN documents on various problems associated with the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The Appendix contains major decisions and resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly on maintaining peace, strengthening international security, disarmament, decolonisation, and economic co-operation.

ПЕТРОВСКИЙ В. Ф. «В интересах народов всего мира:
Борьба СССР на международных конференциях и перего-
ворах за мир, безопасность и предотвращение войны»
М.: Политиздат, 1980. 191 с.

V. F. Petrovsky considers the important role of international conferences and negotiations in the struggle for peace, security,

disarmament and prevention of war throughout the post-war period, especially in the seventies. Shows the stand of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, on the one hand, and the imperialist states and their followers, on the other, on such problems as detente, stopping the arms race, confidence-building and international co-operation. Notes the growing influence of the developing countries on the course and outcome of the struggle over these problems and the importance of the socialist countries' co-operation with them. Shows the importance of UN activities and demonstrates the role of Soviet initiatives and proposals in the UN, the Geneva Disarmament Committee and the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. Proves that where reason and common sense prevail, positive results may be attained to promote the cause of peace, despite ideological differences.

ПОДЛЕСНЫЙ П. Т. «Американские концепции развития отношений с СССР» М.: Наука, 1980. 182 с.

This is a critical analysis of the principal American bourgeois conceptions of structuring relations with the USSR. Contains a detailed account of the genesis and features of the conceptual approach of the Nixon Administration (1969-1974) to relations with the USSR. Examines the influence of the international situation and the political situation in the USA on the American conceptions of relations with the Soviet Union at the time of the Ford Administration (1974-1977). Considers the specificities of the foreign policy conception of the Carter Administration (1976-1981) and the change of course from attempts at "adjusting" detente to cold war.

«По пути, проложенному в Хельсинки: Советский Союз и осуществление Заключительного акта общеевропейского совещания. Сб. документов и материалов» (Сост. А. Л. Адамишин и др.) М.: Политиздат, 1980. 511 с.

This collection contains documents and other material reflecting the activities of the CPSU and the Soviet Government bearing on greater security and co-operation in Europe. Also, major

documents of the Warsaw Treaty states setting forth their joint foreign policy line on ensuring European security. It presents documents on the results of the bilateral meetings and negotiations between the USSR and other participants in the European Conference, and offers facts showing the Soviet Union's consistent implementation of the provisions of the Final Act.

«Проблемы военной разрядки» (Отв. редактор А. Д. Никонов.) М.: Наука, 1981. 380 с.

The monograph studies the objective conditions, aims, basic directions and successes of military detente in the seventies, and also the difficulties and obstacles raised by opponents to the limitation of the arms race, and to exclusion of force and threat of force from international relations. It examines Soviet peace initiatives aimed at preserving and developing international political and military detente, strengthening international security and preventing a world nuclear catastrophe. Stresses that struggle for military detente is especially important in view of the deteriorated international situation created by aggressive imperialist circles and their accomplices. The book contains a short bibliography of works on detente published in the USSR from 1978 to mid-1981.

«Процесс формирования и осуществления внешней политики капиталистических государств» (Отв. ред. В. И. Гантман.) М.: Наука, 1981, 488 с.

This book examines important theoretical problems of international relations bearing on the formation and implementation of the capitalist states' foreign policies, and the general features of this process. Devotes considerable attention to the drafting, taking and realising decisions nationally and internationally. Guided by Marxist-Leninist methodology the authors show the shaping and implementation of capitalist foreign policies as class-oriented in nature and content.

ПЯДЫШЕВ Б. Д. «Опасность: милитаризм в политике, экономике и идеологии США». М.: Воениздат, 1981. 255 с. (Империализм: события, факты, документы).

B. D. Pyadyshev shows that militarism is a long-time companion of the exploiter society, and examines the growth of militarism in the West, specifically in the US. Studies the structure, forms and methods of the military-industrial complex, its pernicious effect on the economy, politics and spiritual life of US society, and on the policy of other capitalist states. Draws on a wealth of facts to demonstrate the manner of action, military doctrines and conceptions of the militarist circles.

Describes the acute political struggle that has flared up between the opponents and supporters of detente and notes the role of the Soviet Union in the struggle against militarism and for peace and international security.

«Разрядка международной напряжённости и идеологическая борьба» (Отв. ред. В. И. Гантмах.) М.: Наука, 1981. 391 с.

This collective work studies the specific features of the ideological struggle in a setting of detente, and also the causes for the exacerbation of this struggle in the late seventies and early eighties. It concentrates on the correlation and interaction of the foreign policies of states and international developments, above all detente, and the confrontation between the ideologies of the two socio-economic systems. It contains a theoretical and specifically historical analysis of the ideological aspects of US foreign and military policy, Soviet-American relations, European security, inter-imperialist contradictions, practices of Maoism on the international scene, the role of the developing countries, and global problems of international relations.

РОЩИН А. А. «Международная безопасность и ядерное оружие». М.: Международные отношения, 1980. 287 с.

A. A. Roshchin reviews the problems of preserving and strengthening international security in the post-war period. The most important of these, the problem of eliminating the threat of nuclear war, is considered at all stages of its development to date, and from various angles—the historical, political, international and legal. Examines the problem of banning nuclear

weapons tests and preventing proliferation of nuclear weapons, creation of nuclear-free and peace zones, the history of the Soviet-American strategic arms limitation talks, and also question relating to non-nuclear disarmament and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Describes the policy of capitalist countries, notably that of the USA, in this field. The book shows the efforts of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to limit and stop the arms race, and analyses international treaties and Soviet initiatives aimed at strengthening international security and eliminating the threat of nuclear war.

The author is a Soviet diplomat who took part in negotiations on most of the questions raised in the book and in drafting corresponding international agreements.

РЫБАКОВ Ю. М. «Вооруженная агрессия — тягчайшее международное преступление». М.: Юридическая литература, 1980. 216 с.

Yu. M. Rybakov analyses political and international legal aspects of the problem of prohibiting armed aggression and its qualification as a grave international crime.

The book considers the main stages of the Soviet Union's struggle for the elaboration of international legal norms banning aggression, for the conclusion of a World Treaty on the Non-Use of Force and Threat of Force in International Relations. It studies the problem of the responsibility of the aggressor state to the victim and the entire international community, and stresses that its effective solution is indispensable for preventing war and strengthening international security.

«Советский Союз и Организация Объединенных Наций. 1971—1975. Сб. статей». (Отв. ред. А. Л. Нарочницкий.) М.: Наука, 1981. 471 с.

This book continues the series of studies of the Soviet Union's activity in the United Nations. Earlier, two volumes were published on the emergence of the UN and its activity up to 1960, and two volumes on the period from 1961 to 1970. The present volume deals with Soviet diplomatic efforts in the UN in the

first five years of the seventies. It studies the Soviet Union's contribution to consolidating international peace and security, solution of disarmament problems and elimination of conflict situations in Asia and the Middle East. It also analyses economic, social and international legal aspects of Soviet activity in the UN, notably in defence of human rights and against racial discrimination and apartheid. It contains texts of several Soviet foreign policy documents and a review of Soviet and foreign literature on the subject.

«Сохранение мира — общее дело всех народов» (Материалы Всемирного парламента народов за мир, проходившего в Софии в сентябре 1980 г.) М.: Изд-во АПН, 1980. 43 с.

That public forum held on the initiative of the World Peace Council was attended by 2,260 delegates from 137 countries, including more than 200 parliamentarians, representatives of more than 300 political parties and organisations, and some 200 trade union leaders, as well as several ministers and prominent personalities in the fields of science and culture, church personalities, and military men. Among the documents included in the volume are the Message of Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, to the Participants in the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace, the Speech of B. N. Ponomarev, Candidate Member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, before the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace, and the Appeal and Charter of the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace. The documents stress that the new US "nuclear strategy" is a perfidious deception of peoples and note that the nations are deeply disturbed by the danger of a world nuclear war. They set forth a programme of struggle for the security of peoples and call for mass action against the arms race, and for the preservation and deepening of detente.

«У карты Мирового океана» (Г. А. Арзуманов, Т. К. Белашенко, Г. Н. Грачиков и др.) М.: Воениздат, 1980. 461 с. с карт.

The first two chapters of this reference book show the economic, political and military significance of the World Ocean and give its physico-geographical description. The other six chapters examine the state structure, political parties and public organisations, economy, main ports, and armed forces of littoral states (along the shores of Europe, Asia, Africa, America, Australia, Oceania, and the Arctic Ocean). The authors show the World Ocean as a zone of aggressive militarist designs. They review the history of colonial expansion, and describe aggressive role of the US and NATO in the World Ocean today, their policy of military bases that endangers peace. The authors consider the tasks that are required to improve the international situation in the World Ocean, stamp out the existing flashpoints, and turn the World Ocean into a zone of peace.

УСАЧЕВ И. Г. «Международная разрядка и США». М.: Мысль, 1980. 221 с.

I. G. Usachev examines the content and motive forces of the process of detente. Analyses the changes that took place in US foreign policy in the seventies under the influence of foreign and domestic policy factors. Special attention is devoted to the development of Soviet-American relations in the seventies, the exacerbation of inter-imperialist contradictions under detente, and the evolution of US foreign policy vis-à-vis the developing countries.

ФЕДОРОВ Е. К. «Научные аспекты политических переговоров: Из опыта заключения соглашений о запрещении испытаний ядерного оружия и враждебного воздействия на природную среду». М.: Наука, 1981. 206 с.

The late prominent Soviet scientist, Academician Fedorov, analyses the interaction of political, scientific and technical factors in international negotiations on the limitation of the arms race, pointing to the growing significance of objective scientific expertise for reaching effective agreements. Relying on his rich personal experience of participating in the scientific preparations of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water, and also of the International Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile

Use of Environmental Modification Technique, he shows that the solution to complex scientific and technical problems, particularly those of verification, largely depends on the political position of the sides and their political stake in limiting and stopping the arms race and starting disarmament.

ШАХНАЗАРОВ Г. Х. «Грядущий миропорядок: о тенденциях и перспективах международных отношений». М.: Политиздат, 1981. 447 с.

G. Kh. Shakhnazarov studies the leading tendencies in the development of humankind. He considers them in the light of the prospects in international affairs and in the context of the social order prevailing in the world. The author analyses the vital problems of today, such as safeguarding peace, provision of basic needs, overcoming economic backwardness, and problems of ecology and ethology. He uses the Marxist-Leninist method in criticising the views and conceptions of some Western politologists and futurologists, notably their models of the world order.

PEACE AND DETENTE. CHRONICLE OF EVENTS

APRIL 1980-DECEMBER 1981¹

1980

April 3

—A session of the Soviet-American Standing Consultative Commission completed its work in Geneva. The Commission was set up in 1972 to promote the purposes and provisions of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems and the Interim Agreement on Certain Measures with Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, concluded on May 26, 1972, and of the Agreement on Measures to Reduce the Risk of Accidental Nuclear War, concluded on September 30, 1971. Succeeding sessions of the Commission gathered in Geneva on September 24-October 24, 1980, May 27-July 8, and October 14-November 19, 1981.

April 4

—The Third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea ends the first part of its 9th Session in New York, which opened on March 3. The second part of the Session took place in Geneva on July 28-August 29 that year. Nearly 150 states participate in the Conference. The 10th Session of the Conference gathered in New York on March 9-April 17 and in Geneva on August 3-28, 1981.

¹ For "Chronicle of Events, January 1979-March 1980" see *Peace and Disarmament. Academic Studies*. 1980. Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1980, pp. 219-250.

April 11

—The Soviet Ambassador to the United Nations hands UN Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim a letter of the USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs A. A. Gromyko concerning the objectives of the Second Disarmament Decade.

*April
23-25*

—Foreign Minister of the USSR A. A. Gromyko visits Paris. His talks there concerned various aspects of Soviet-French relations, the present state of international relations, and matters related to the preparations and prospects of the Madrid meeting of the 35 states that participated in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

April 25

—The UN Security Council considers the complaint of Lebanon and adopts a resolution condemning Israel's armed intervention in Lebanon, the violation of Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity, Tel-Aviv's military aid to the separatists, and all its hostility actions against the UN force in Lebanon.

*April
28-29*

—The Meeting of European Communist and Workers' Parties for Peace and Disarmament in Paris, attended by delegations of 22 parties, issues an Appeal of the Communists to the Peoples of the European Countries for Peace and Disarmament.

April 29

—The first part of the Disarmament Committee's 1980 Session completes its work in Geneva. The Session opened on February 5, 1980. For the first time, all the nuclear powers were represented.

May 5-11

—A Week of Action for European Security and Co-operation is held under the auspices of the World Peace Council.

May 8-10

—Session of the Presidential Committee of the World Peace Council in Budapest, attended by nearly 300 representatives of the public from 75 countries and 12 international organisations, endorses the Appeal, "Attention: War Danger!"

May 12-17

—Fourth Inter-Parliamentary Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (Brussels).

*May 13-
June 6*

—The UN Disarmament Commission meets in New York. All UN member-states attend. Its agenda is drawing up a resolution declaring the eighties the Second Disarmament Decade.

May 14

—The Government of Afghanistan endorses a programme for the settlement of the situation around Afghanistan and the normalisation of relations with Pakistan and Iran by peaceful means, through bilateral negotiations.

May 14-15

—The Meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty States (Warsaw) adopts a Declaration on the 25th anniversary of the Warsaw Treaty, reaffirming that the member-states are resolved to work for and uphold detente together with all peace-loving states and public forces, so as to make it a continuous and comprehensive process universal in scope. As before, they are ready to deepen and develop rela-

tions with all countries of Europe and the world by broadening the tried forms of co-operation and initiating new ones. Concrete proposals were made to secure negotiations on military detente and reduction of the level of military confrontation in Europe and the world, and to find ways to achieve disarmament.

May 15-16

—The 25th anniversary of the signing of the State Treaty Re-establishing an Independent and Democratic Austria is observed in Vienna. The foreign ministers of the 4 great powers—the USSR, France, the USA, and Great Britain—that signed the Treaty, attended. A. A. Gromyko met the foreign ministers of France, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States (May 16), of Great Britain and Italy (May 17). The ministers discussed bilateral relations and topical international problems. On May 17, A. A. Gromyko met Austrian Federal Chancellor Bruno Kreisky.

*May 15-
July 24*

—The 21st round of the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. On July 10, on behalf of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries directly participating in the talks, the USSR delegation submitted new important proposals, which take account of essential elements of the Western position. The socialist states consider it necessary to concentrate the main effort on working out an agreement on the first stage of reduction. One of the key points of the agreement is the reduction of Soviet and US armed forces in Central Europe (by 20,000 and 13,000 servicemen respectively). The socialist countries also propose a compromise procedure for maintaining the collective troop strength of both military-political alliances in Central Europe, that should be established as a result of the two stages of reduction.

May 19

—President Leonid Brezhnev has talks with French President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing in Warsaw. They discussed the international situation and initiatives aimed at easing international tension, and matters of bilateral relations.

*May 22-
July 7*

—Another round of Soviet-American talks in Geneva to draft a joint proposal, to be submitted to the Disarmament Committee, on complete, universal and controlled prohibition of chemical weapons and elimination of their stockpiles. On July 8, the USSR and the USA submitted to the Committee a joint report on the progress of bilateral discussions.

May 23-25

—An international conference of solidarity with the Asian and African peoples' struggle for independence, security, and social and economic progress (Colombo), convened on the initiative of the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organisation on the 25th anniversary of the Bandung Conference. Discussed the situation in the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean, in Southern Africa, Southeast Asia and the Middle East. Much attention was devoted to detente and disarmament.

May 26-28

—An international forum, Dialogue on Problems of Disarmament and Detente, is held in Vienna. At the forum, parliamentarians and political and public figures representing some 60 parties from 38 countries, called for the World Disarmament Conference.

May 30

—On behalf of the socialist community, the delegation of the GDR submits to the UN Disarmament Commission in New York a working document on various aspects of the arms race.

*May 30-
June 1*

—An international conference of parliamentarians for peace, disarmament and international security convened in Helsinki on the joint initiative of the World Peace Council and the Finnish Diet. It was attended by more than 100 parliamentarians from 40 countries. The participants adopted an Appeal to the Parliamentarians of the World.

June 2-6

—An international conference in Teheran inquires into US aggressive actions against Iran. Over 100 delegates from 50 countries participated. The resolution of the conference condemned the USA for interfering in the internal affairs of Iran, and the armed operation sanctioned by the Carter Administration on April 24-25 on the pretext of rescuing the hostages detained in the US Embassy in Teheran since November 1979.

June 3-7

—Indian Foreign Minister P. V. Narasimha Rao pays an official visit to the USSR. The USSR and India reiterated their common opinion that the process of detente should be extended to all regions of the world.

June 10

—A meeting of the Socialist International Bureau attended by nearly 100 leaders of affiliated parties gathers in Oslo. The Bureau called for continuation of the East-West dialogue and ratification of the SALT-2 Treaty.

*June 12-
August 10*

—Summer session of the Disarmament Committee in Geneva.

June 13

—UN Security Council extends the mandate of the UN peace-keeping force in Cyprus for six more months

(till December 15). On December 11, the mandate was extended to June 15, 1981.

June 16

—A conference of representatives of national peace movements in NATO countries convenes in Brussels. A programme is drawn up of new mass action against the arms race and the conversion of Europe into a launching pad for US nuclear missiles.

June 16-19

—Members of the parliaments of Warsaw Treaty countries meet in Minsk to observe the 25th anniversary of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation. On June 17, they adopted an Appeal to Parliaments and Parliamentarians of Europe and the World.

June 16-19

—UN-sponsored conference of non-governmental organisations, Arms Race and Humanity, convenes in New York, attended by representatives of over 50 countries.

June 17

—UN Security Council extends the mandate of the UN force in Lebanon till December 19. On December 17, the mandate was again renewed for six more months.

June 18

—International conference for the abolition of military bases in the Mediterranean (Herakleion, Greece).

June 22

—Press reports the announcement by the command of the Soviet military contingent in Afghanistan that upon agreement with the Afghan government they have begun withdrawing to Soviet territory some units, whose presence is no longer necessary in Afghanistan.

June 23

—A Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee hears A. A. Gromyko's Report on the International Situation and Soviet Foreign Policy, and adopts a resolution in which confidence is voiced that there exist objective opportunities and socio-political forces capable of preventing a drift towards a new cold war. The solution lies in negotiations based on strict observance of the principle of equality and equal security.

June 26

—Delegations of the USSR, the USA and Great Britain hold another meeting in Geneva to draft a treaty on the complete and universal prohibition of nuclear weapon tests (the preceding round of meetings was in February 7-April 1, 1980). On July 31 a report of the three countries on the progress of the negotiations was submitted to the Disarmament Committee.

June 28

—A UN Security Council session gathers at Angola's request to discuss the invasion of its territory by South African troops, started on June 7. The Security Council denounced the deliberate, persistent and continuous incursions into Angola. The USA, Britain and France abstained from voting.

*June 30-
July 1*

—Federal Chancellor Helmut Schmidt and Vice Chancellor, Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher visit Moscow. On July 5, the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers announced that they had considered the results of the talks with the FRG delegation, and wholly approved the work of the Soviet delegation headed by Leonid Brezhnev. At the talks, Brezhnev advanced a set of new ideas and proposals. Among other things, he proposed that discussion

of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe should begin simultaneously and in close connection with discussion of US forward-based nuclear systems. It was noted that any accords on these questions could be carried into practice only after the Soviet-US Treaty on the Limitation of Strategic Arms (SALT-2) enters into force.

July 14-30

—World Conference of the UN Decade for Women in Copenhagen, under the motto “Equality, Development, Peace”, attended by representatives of 136 countries and 9 national liberation movements and international organisations.

*July 19-
August 3*

—The 22nd Olympic Games are held in Moscow. Despite attempts by governments of certain imperialist states to organise a boycott, athletes from 81 nations took part. Addressing competitors and guests of the Moscow Olympics, Leonid Brezhnev wrote: “The Olympic Games are an outstanding event in world sports, attesting to the striving of all nations for peace, accord, and beauty. It is gratifying to note that athletes of most countries of all continents have gathered under the Olympic flag in Moscow. This shows once again that the aspirations of the peoples to communication and co-operation, hallowed by their experience and traditions of many centuries, cannot be overcome.”

July 29

—The 7th Special Session of the UN General Assembly (New York, July 22-29) passes a resolution on the Middle East, in which the right of the Palestinian people to having their own independent state is reaffirmed.

July 30

—The press publishes Leonid Brezhnev's answers to questions of *Pravda* editors on the 5th anniversary of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Brezhnev said that "the day of the signing of the Final Act could well become Europe Day, like the memorable dates observed by peoples of other continents. But that day is more than a holiday. It is also a call to promote and consolidate detente and peace."

August 1

—The press publishes a TASS report that the withdrawal from the GDR to the territory of the USSR of 20,000 Soviet servicemen and 1,000 tanks, and other military equipment, has been completed. The withdrawal was announced by Leonid Brezhnev on October 6, 1979, and began on December 5, 1979.

*August
6-13*

—An Action Week for the prohibition of nuclear weapons, sponsored by the World Peace Council. It was observed in many countries.

*August 11-
September 7*

—Second International Conference to review the operation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The Conference was held in Geneva and attended by delegations of 75 countries.

August 17

—The press publishes a letter of Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko to Kurt Waldheim, UN Secretary-General, containing the proposal to put the question of "the historical responsibility of states for the preservation of Nature for living and future generations" on the agenda of the 35th UN General Assembly.

August 20

—UN Security Council adopts by a vote of 14 in favour, and 1 abstention (USA) a resolution on Jerusalem. The resolution denounces administrative and legal measures taken by Israel to change the character and status of Jerusalem, and calls on the countries that opened their legations in that city, to withdraw them.

August 24

—The press reports that the CPSU Central Committee examined the results of Leonid Brezhnev's meetings with leaders of fraternal parties and socialist countries in the Crimea in July-August 1980. The Crimean meetings of 1980, like the WTO Political Consultative Committee meeting in Warsaw, confirmed that in their foreign policy the socialist states give priority to safeguarding and consolidating peace, and ensuring the right of all peoples to free and independent development. There is no topical problem in Europe or elsewhere that the socialist countries would not be prepared to settle at the negotiating table.

*August 25-
September 15*

—A special UN General Assembly session on economic questions gathers in New York. The document on International Development Strategy for the Third UN Development Decade, approved by the session, stresses the close linkage between development and detente. The document sets the objective of securing progress towards general and complete disarmament.

August 29

—Leonid Brezhnev speaks at a meeting in Alma-Ata on the 60th anniversary of the founding of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic and the Kazakhstan Communist Party. Addressing pressing international issues, Brezhnev emphasises that the "new nuclear strategy" of the USA is extremely dangerous for the peoples of the world, its

essence being to make nuclear war more acceptable to the public by references to "limited" and "selective" use of nuclear weapons. Referring to the new proposals advanced by the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community in 1980 and aimed to ensure détente and achieve disarmament, Brezhnev said: "We are waiting for a response to our proposals from leaders of the Western powers. We are ready for concrete action in the name of strengthening peace and improving the international situation, and expect the same from them!".

*End of
August*

—Broad public and political groups all over the world condemned the "new nuclear strategy" issued by the US Administration (on August 20, US Defence Secretary Harold Brown announced the coming into force of Presidential Directive 59 signed by James Carter on July 25). Among the many statements denouncing the doctrine of "limited nuclear war", is that of the US group, Physicians for Social Responsibility, saying that the new doctrine causes serious apprehensions because it is based on the mistaken assumption that nuclear war is winnable and there would be those who survive it.

*September
8-12*

—The World Energy Conference attended by nearly 5,000 experts from 75 countries convenes in Munich.

*September
9-12*

—An Islamic conference devoted to beginning of the 15th century of the Hegira (the Muslim era) was held in Tashkent. The conference, convened under the motto "The 15th Century of the Hegira Must Become a Century of Peace and Friendship Among Nations" was attended by Muslims from over 30 countries of Asia, Africa and Europe, and by delegations from other Chur-

ches, and international and regional religious organisations. They endorsed an Appeal to All Muslims of the World, which called on all people of goodwill to work together for peace, progress and prosperity. The Appeal describes US imperialism as the main obstacle to the independent development of Muslim states, and a source of the war danger.

*September 9-
November 11*

—A preparatory meeting for the forthcoming forum of states that participated in the Conference on Cooperation and Security in Europe gathers in Madrid.

*September 15-
October 10*

—The second session of the UN Conference on the prohibition or restriction of the use of certain types of conventional weapons that may be regarded as exclusively cruel or non-selective gathers in Geneva, attended by representatives of some 80 nations. The Conference drafts the text of a Convention and three Protocols.

*September 16-
December 18*

—The 35th UN General Assembly sits in New York. The Assembly reconvened several times in 1981.

*September
23-27*

—The World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace convenes in Sofia. Delegates of 137 countries and over 100 international organisations discuss the action programme of peace fighters. Participants adopt an appeal urging the peoples to join efforts to reduce the danger of a nuclear war (September 24), and the Charter of the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace (September 27).

September 24

—A. A. Gromyko sends a letter to Kurt Waldheim, requesting the inclusion in the agenda of the 35th UN General Assembly of the important and urgent item, "Some urgent measures to reduce the danger of war".

September 25

—In New York, Andrei Gromyko and Edmund Muskie exchange views concerning talks on the mutual limitation of nuclear weapons. They agree that Soviet and US representatives should meet in Geneva with the purpose of starting effective discussions.

*September 25-
December 18*

—The 22nd round of the Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe is held. On November 13 the socialist states directly participating in the talks (the GDR, Poland, the USSR, and Czechoslovakia) advanced new compromise proposals: on the condition that the West shows a constructive approach to the July proposals of the socialist countries, the latter are prepared (in the framework of the first agreement) to accept the collective freezing of the armed forces of the direct participants in the talks other than the USSR and the USA for the period between the two stages of reduction. This takes into account the wishes of Western countries not to set any individual limits on the strength of the armed forces of direct participants.

*September
26-28*

—A regional forum, "For a Nuclear-Free Zone in the Pacific, for Independence and Peace," gathers in Sydney, attended by delegates from Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Fiji, Vanuatu, Japan and other countries.

October
8-10

Hafiz Al-Assad, General Secretary of the Baath Party (Arab Socialist Renaissance), President of Syria, pays an official friendly visit to the USSR at the head of a party and government delegation. The Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation between the Soviet Union and Syria is signed on October 8.

October
15-24

—Babrak Karmal, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party, Chairman of the Revolutionary Council and Prime Minister of Afghanistan, pays an official friendly visit to the USSR. The Soviet-Afghan Statement signed on October 16 after the completion of negotiations stresses that no problem of interest to mankind should ever be tackled from a position of force and *diktat*, and expresses the conviction that "no country and no government should abstain from the struggle for peace, international security, and real disarmament".

October 17-
November 17

—The first round of the Soviet-American talks on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe is held in Geneva. The sides agreed that the date for the resumption of the talks in 1981 will be agreed later by bilateral consultation.

October
19-20

—The Foreign Ministers Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Countries convenes in the Polish capital to consider preparations for the Madrid follow-up meeting.

October
24-30

—The UN-sponsored Week of Action for Disarmament

is held. Mass demonstrations, meetings and gatherings take place in many countries.

October 25

—The 21st Session of the UNESCO General Conference in Belgrade, attended by representatives of 153 nations, adopts a resolution on UNESCO's part in marshalling public support for the drive to halt the arms race and to begin disarmament, drafted by the Soviet Union. It also approved a resolution initiated by Poland on UNESCO's contribution to peace, and its tasks in securing human rights, and in abolishing colonialism and racism. The document contains a set of measures furthering UN General Assembly declarations on education in the spirit of peace.

*October 27-
November 10*

—Mengistu Haile Mariam, Chairman of the Provisional Military Administrative Council of Ethiopia and of the Commission for Organising the Party of the Working People of Ethiopia, pays an official friendly visit to the USSR. A Joint Soviet-Ethiopian Statement is signed on November 10.

*October
28-30*

—An Extraordinary International Conference of Solidarity with Anti-Imperialist Struggle of the Peoples of the Persian Gulf Zone is held in Nicosia, Cyprus, under the auspices of the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organisation and the Arab People's Congress. Participants in the Conference stressed the special danger arising from the establishment of US bases in Oman, Kenya, Somalia (the USA concluded pertinent agreements on June 4, June 26, August 21, 1980, respectively), Egypt, Bahrain and Saudi Arabia, and the creation of the US rapid deployment force. The Conference called on Iraq and Iran to halt hostilities started on September 22,

and to start negotiating a peaceful settlement of their dispute.

*November
9-12*

—Italian Foreign Minister Emilio Colombo pays an official visit to the USSR. The Joint Soviet-Italian Communiqué says: "As before, the sides hold that detente is an indispensable, possible and useful process, and express readiness to do everything in their power to make it the leading tendency in international relations."

November 11

—Representatives of the 35 countries that took part in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe opened their meeting in Madrid. The first stage of the meeting was completed on December 19, 1980.

*November
12-17*

—Finnish President Urho Kekkonen pays an official visit to the USSR. At the Soviet-Finnish talks on November 12, Leonid Brezhnev stressed that the peaceful foreign policy of Finland and its contribution to detente in Europe is highly appreciated in the Soviet Union. Addressing co-operation in Northern Europe and the Baltic, the sides emphasised the topicality of Kekkonen's proposal to declare the North of Europe a nuclear-free zone.

*November
13-16*

—The XV Congress of the Socialist International in Madrid calls for arms limitation and ratification of the SALT-2 Treaty, and condemns the concept of "limited" nuclear war.

November 16

—The Public Forum in Krefeld (FRG) issues an appeal calling on the FRG Government to reverse its

decision to deploy new US Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in Europe and to take a stand in the NATO alliance that would absolve Western Germany of the suspicion that it wants to be the instigator of a new twist in the arms race, which would do harm to the European nations first of all (the Krefeld Appeal). The campaigners set the goal of collecting 1 million signatures to the Appeal (by the end of August of 1981 it was signed by 2 million).

November 16

—The 30th anniversary of the World Peace Council, a broad mass organisation of peace fighters. The decision to set up the WPC was taken at the 2nd World Congress for Peace in Warsaw. Today, the WPC represents peace movements in most countries across the world.

*November
17-22*

—President of Mozambique and Chairman of the Mozambique Liberation Front (FRELIMO), Samora Moises Machel, pays an official friendly visit to the USSR at the head of a party and government delegation. A Joint Soviet-Mozambican Statement is signed on November 18.

*November
21-22*

—Public personalities from 21 European countries and representatives of 12 international organisations hold Dialogue-Madrid-80 in Brussels. In their Statement, they express the hope that the Madrid meeting will reaffirm the striving of the peoples for detente and arms limitation.

November 23

—A consultative meeting of twelve European national movements against the nuclear-missile threat and against the siting of new US missiles in Western Europe gathers

in Amsterdam under the auspices of the Dutch co-operation group "Stop the N-bomb—Stop the Nuclear Arms Race".

November 24

—After his meeting with Jimmy Carter and President-elect Ronald Reagan in the USA (November 19-21) Helmut Schmidt states in the Bundestag that the FRG is in favour of continuing the process initiated by the Helsinki Final Act.

November 26

—The UN Security Council extends the mandate of UN monitoring the disengagement of troops in the Syrian-Israeli sector for 6 more months, till May 31, 1981. In May 1981 the mandate was extended for another 6 months.

December 4

—The UN General Assembly adopts a resolution in support of the Soviet proposals to work out and conclude a World Treaty on the Non-Use of Force in International Relations. The NATO countries, Israel and Japan voted against.

December 4

—The first meeting of the Preparatory Committee for the 2nd Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament closes in New York. The Committee is composed of representatives of 78 states.

December 5

—Leaders of Warsaw Treaty member-states meet in Moscow. They exchange views on the international situation, stressing that the socialist states are determined to work for an improvement of the international climate; they call for closer solidarity of all peoples in fighting the war threat, and for peace and disarmament, notably nuclear disarmament, detente and equal co-

operation. They exchanged information on the progress of socialist and communist construction in their countries. Representatives of the Polish United Workers' Party briefed the other participants on the state of affairs in Poland. Participants in the meeting expressed their confidence that the Communists, the working class and the working people of fraternal Poland would overcome the present difficulties, and declared that socialist Poland, the Polish United Workers' Party and the Polish people could count on the fraternal solidarity and support of the Warsaw Treaty countries.

December 7

—The Presiding Committee of the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organisation meets in Nicosia, with representatives of public and political organisations and national liberation movements of over 50 countries attending. They called for an early settlement of the armed conflict between Iraq and Iran, and adopted a resolution condemning the posture of US imperialist circles and the great-power chauvinism and hegemonic policy of the Chinese leadership.

December 8

—At the Madrid meeting the Polish delegation submits a proposal to convene a conference on military detente and disarmament in Europe of countries party to the Helsinki Final Act.

December 8-11

—Leonid Brezhnev pays an official friendly visit to India. A Soviet-Indian Joint Declaration, signed on December 10, says the USSR and India are convinced that strengthening peace and preventing nuclear war is the cardinal task facing humanity today. The Declaration registers identity of views on a number of specific international matters, notably those related to Asia and the Indian Ocean. Addressing members of the Indian

Parliament on December 10, Brezhnev advances a far-ranging programme for neutralising and demilitarising the Persian Gulf area. He proposes that the USA, other Western powers, China, Japan and other states that may have an interest in the matter, should discuss and agree on the following mutual commitments:

- to set up no foreign military bases and to station no nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction in the Persian Gulf area and the adjoining islands;
- to renounce use or threat of force against the Persian Gulf states, and any interference in their internal affairs;
- to respect the non-aligned status of the littoral states in the Persian Gulf, and to refrain from involving them in any military alliances with any of the nuclear powers;
- to respect the sovereign right of the states in the region to their natural resources;
- to create no obstacles or threats to normal trading and to navigation along routes linking the Gulf countries with other countries of the world.

December 12

—The UN General Assembly adopts a set of resolutions on disarmament.

December 12-13

—The Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, a non-governmental international organisation, holds its first working session in Vienna. The Commission was set up in September 1980 to exchange views and work out recommendations on the ways and means of checking the arms race, and strengthening peace and international security. It includes prominent political and public personalities, and noted scholars of Europe, America, Asia and Africa, and is headed by Olof Palme, Chairman of the Swedish Social Democratic Labour Party and former Prime Minister. The

Commission agreed on working out recommendations for the 2nd Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament.

December
19-23

—Norwegian Foreign Minister Knut Frydenlund pays an official visit to the USSR. The Soviet-Norwegian Communique expresses the hope that early progress will be achieved at the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe.

December
23-24

—A conference is held in Lagos (Nigeria) on the initiative of the Organisation of African Unity to discuss the situation in Chad where after an armed conflict that lasted for many years the troops of Goukouni Oueddei, head of the transitional government of national unity defeated the units of former Defence Minister Hissène Habré by mid-December 1980. The conference, attended by delegations of 13 African countries, resolved to convene an African conference on aid to Chad.

1981

January
5-19

—A delegation of the Soviet Peace Committee led by its Chairman Evgeny Fyodorov, visits the USA at the invitation of the American Friends Service Committee.

January
7-14

—A UN-sponsored conference on Namibia is held in Geneva. The conference fails on account of the stand taken by the delegation of South Africa, which demanded that the UN should cancel its resolution recognising

the South West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO) as the sole lawful representative of the Namibian people.

January
12-13

—Leaders of the social-democratic parties of Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Denmark and Norway meet in Amsterdam. Among them are Norwegian Defence Minister Thorwald Stoltenberg, Chairman of the Netherlands Labour Party Joop den Uyl, Chairman of the Party of Flemish Socialists Karel Van Miert, and Danish Foreign Minister Kjeld Olesen. The meeting worked out a common attitude to the nuclear arms race and the plans to deploy new US medium-range missiles in some European NATO countries. The participants expressed concern over Washington's efforts to get the Netherlands and Belgium to agree to siting US missiles in their territory (Denmark and Norway previously in principle rejected deployment of nuclear weapons on their soil in peacetime).

January
14-15

—A preparatory meeting for a World Conference, Dialogue on Problems of Disarmament and Detente is held in Vienna. Representatives of many political parties, public organisations and science centres from all continents discuss a variety of problems related to detente and disarmament. They agree to set up an international committee and an Austrian committee for the convocation in Vienna of a World Conference, Dialogue on Problems of Disarmament and Detente.

January
19-23

—A World Forum of Youth and Students for Peace, Detente and Disarmament gathers in Helsinki, attended by some 500 foreign delegates and representatives of 49 Finnish youth organisations.

January
23-26

—A session of the Bureau of the Presidential Committee of the World Peace Council takes place in Antananarivo (Madagascar). The session adopts the resolution "Peace and Disarmament of the 80s", a declaration on making the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf a peace zone, a resolution on Namibia and South Africa reasserting solidarity with the people of Namibia and demanding that they be allowed to exercise their right to self-determination, and a resolution on solidarity with the people of El Salvador.

January
25-28

—The third summit conference of Muslim countries convenes in Mecca and at Taif (Saudi Arabia), attended by representatives of 37 states (Afghanistan, Iran, Libya and Egypt did not participate). It passed a number of resolutions, some of which reflect conflicting tendencies. Some documents are distinctly anti-imperialist (in particular the resolution on Palestine and Jerusalem). On the other hand, the agenda included the non-existent "Afghan question". Participants discussed problems related to the settlement of the Iran-Iraq armed conflict, which has since September 1980 developed into a war of attrition. The conference called for an early armistice. A special committee was formed, as required by the resolution, to mediate between Baghdad and Teheran. The Mecca Declaration resolutely denounces the Camp David deal and declares the readiness of Muslim states to work for a just settlement of the Middle East conflict by all means at their disposal, including oil.

January 27

—The second stage of the Madrid meeting of 35 states begins.

January
27-28

—The foreign ministers of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea meet in Ho Chi Minh City (Vietnam). In the declaration On Peace, Stability, Friendship and Co-operation in Southeast Asia the three countries propose that a regional conference of ASEAN countries and the states of Indochina should convene to discuss peace, stability and co-operation in Southeast Asia and to conclude a treaty of peace and stability with the ASEAN countries. The Ministers declared readiness to sign bilateral peaceful co-existence treaties with the People's Republic of China.

*January 29-
April 7*

—The 23rd round of talks on mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe takes place in Vienna.

January 31

—A TASS Statement on Ronald Reagan's first press-conference as President of the United States (January 30) says that the US President deliberately distorted the objectives and nature of Soviet foreign policy. Reagan said, among other things, that "so far detente's been a one-way street that the Soviet Union has used to pursue its own aims". In substance, this raises the question of who benefits from peace—the Soviet Union or the United States. However, TASS Statement points out, peace is equally indispensable to all people, to all nations, including the Soviet and American peoples.

February 3

—A TASS Statement is published on the pronouncements of the new US Secretary of State Alexander Haig, who accuses the Soviet Union of involvement in "international terrorism". All charges of Soviet involvement in terrorist activities, the Statement says, are gross and malicious deception. The Soviet Union has always been

and will be firmly opposed to the theory and practice of terrorism. The Statement says that the Soviet leadership hopes that Washington will take steps to stop the hostile campaign against the Soviet Union and take up the really important matter of improving American-Soviet relations. If it does so, it will find that the Soviet Union is prepared for constructive dialogue.

*February 3-
April 24*

—A statutory session of the Disarmament Committee gathers in Geneva, at which representatives of 40 nations discuss a wide range of problems bearing on practically all aspects of disarmament.

*February
5-6*

—Valéry Giscard d'Estaing and Chancellor Helmut Schmidt meet in Paris. Their joint statement says it is essential to continue efforts to maintain peace and stabilise East-West relations.

*February
5-6*

—The Special Committee of Non-Governmental Organisations for Disarmament holds a session in Geneva, attended by representatives of 24 international organisations and 7 non-governmental organisations of 5 nations. The key items on the agenda: developments in the field of disarmament and detente (summing up discussions on disarmament at the 35th UN General Assembly); doctrine of "limited" nuclear war; activity of non-governmental organisations in promoting disarmament; the Madrid CSCE follow-up meeting; preparations for the 2nd Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament.

February
7-8

—The Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues meets in Vienna. The Commission issues a document, *The SALT Process—The Global Stakes*, stressing the importance of continuity and consistency in the process of strategic arms limitation.

February
9-12

—A conference of non-aligned foreign ministers gathers in Delhi, attended by delegates of 93 countries (full members of the non-aligned movement) and two national liberation organisations, and also by representatives of 36 countries, organisations and national liberation movements as observers and guests. The final declaration stresses the participating countries' dedication to the basic principles and purposes of the non-aligned movement—struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, apartheid and racism, including Zionism. By decision of the conference, a mission of goodwill is set up to search for ways and means of settling the Irano-Iraqi armed conflict.

February 17-
March 4

—The UN Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean gathers to prepare for an international conference to be held in 1981 in accordance with a UN General Assembly decision to draw up an international agreement on the conversion of the Indian Ocean into a peace zone. Owing to obstructions on the part of the US, the session postponed discussion of the date of the conference.

February 22

—The Soviet ambassadors in Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and a number of other Asian countries hand the respective governments a message of the Soviet Government saying that the Soviet

Union is deeply interested in finding ways to normalise the situation in Southeast Asia. The Soviet leadership has thoroughly examined the proposals of the foreign ministers of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea made at their Ho Chi Minh conference in January, and welcomes the idea of a peace zone in Southeast Asia. The Soviet leadership finds it necessary to call on the governments of Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines, Malaysia and Singapore to demonstrate political realism and to take due notice of the constructive proposals of the Indochina states.

*February 23-
March 3*

—The 26th Congress of the CPSU is held in Moscow. The key item on the agenda is the Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy, delivered by Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. In the Report, Brezhnev advances new cardinal ideas and important constructive proposals in the field of international affairs. They are an organic continuation and development of the Peace Programme of the 24th (1971) and 25th (1976) congresses of the CPSU, addressing the most pressing problems of present-day international life. The present international situation, the 26th Congress stressed, calls for additional efforts. Accordingly, a set of new measures covering a wide range of issues is set forth in the Central Committee Report, concerning conventional as well as nuclear arms, and land, naval, and air forces, and touching on the situation in Europe, the Middle East and the Far East. Measures in the political as well as military field are envisaged. In his closing speech at the Congress, Leonid Brezhnev specifically emphasises the significance of the Foreign Policy Programme approved by the Congress. He says:

“The entire course of our Congress and all the docu-

ments it adopted have once again shown that our main concern in the international arena, the principal foreign policy aim of our state has been and remains the preservation of peace.

"Our foreign policy programme is one of continuing and deepening detente, a programme of struggle for ending the arms race.

"Our Party has shown once again that the Soviet people have not only the desire but the political resolve to do everything for peace—for a lasting, unshakable peace. We not only have the will to struggle for peace, but a precise and clear-cut programme for struggle."

On March 3 the plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee again re-elected Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

March 5

—Ecuador and Peru sign an agreement ending their border conflict that started on January 29 as a result of mutual territorial claims. Under the agreement the troops of the two states are being withdrawn from the disputed areas along the border.

March 14

—The press reports that Leonid Brezhnev sent a message to the heads of state and government of a number of countries, drawing their attention to the important Soviet foreign policy proposals advanced at the 26th Congress of the CPSU. Brezhnev expressed hope that the new proposals, aimed at strengthening peace, deepening detente and curbing the arms race, would be duly studied by the governments concerned.

March 14

—Speaking in Frankfurt-on-Main, Chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany Willy Brandt urged the West to respond constructively to the new Soviet peace proposals advanced at the 26th Congress of the CPSU.

March 19

—The Soviet press publishes a TASS Statement on the intention announced by President Ronald Reagan to go on providing US arms to Afghan counter-revolutionary bands raiding Afghanistan from the territories of Pakistan and Iran. By so doing, the Statement says, the US Administration would make the situation in Southwest Asia still more complicated and create new impediments to a political settlement over Afghanistan.

*March
20-21*

—A conference of socialist and social-democratic parties of West European countries is held in Paris, devoting much attention to the new peace proposals advanced at the 26th Congress of the CPSU.

*April
2-4*

—Hans-Dietrich Genscher, Vice-Chancellor and Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany, pays an official visit to Moscow. Discussing international matters and certain aspects of disarmament, Genscher expounds on the attitude held by the FRG Government and NATO. At the same time, he spoke out for continuing the East-West dialogue in order to stabilise the situation in Europe.

April 4

—The press publishes Leonid Brezhnev's answer to a question by the Greek newspaper *Ta Nea*, in which he stresses that "the Soviet Union has stated time and again that it will never use nuclear weapons against countries which do not produce or acquire nuclear weapons and do not have them on their territory. That in itself is a firm enough guarantee. But we are prepared to go further and conclude at any time a special agreement with any non-nuclear country, naturally including Greece, if, for its part, it undertakes not to have nuclear weapons on its territory."

April 4

—At a plenary session, participants decide to adjourn the Madrid CSCE follow-up meeting on April 11 until May 4.

April 5-12

—An Asia Week is held on the initiative of the World Peace Council. Participants in various Asia Week actions emphasise that lasting peace in Asia would greatly benefit the world political climate.

April 6-10

—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolai Tikhonov pays an official visit to Austria, where he has talks with Chancellor Bruno Kreisky. The Soviet-Austrian Communiqué notes that “the Federal Chancellor of Austria expressed satisfaction over the fact that the Soviet Union was firmly in favour of continuing the detente process. He welcomed the readiness of the Soviet side for dialogue with the West and called for a thorough examination of the new Soviet proposals.” Both sides said that “deepening the process of detente, including military detente, and expanding peaceful co-operation on the continent would benefit the interests of all states in Europe”. They hoped that the Madrid meeting would adopt a decision to convene a conference on the military aspects of security in Europe.

April 7

—In a speech at the 16th Congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, Leonid Brezhnev stresses that the unrestrained nuclear arms race in Europe is a mortal danger to all European nations. The proposal of the 26th Congress of the CPSU to at least consolidate what has already been achieved is particularly timely, since it envisages halting any stationing in Europe of new medium-range missiles and replacing the existing ones belonging to the USSR and to NATO countries. But the proposed moratorium is not an end in itself. It is

being proposed in order to create a more favourable atmosphere for negotiations. "The objective we pursue in the matter," Brezhnev notes, "...is reduction by the sides of the quantity of nuclear missiles in Europe."

April 10

—Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects is put up for signing at UN headquarters in New York.

April 18

—An international mass demonstration is held in Brussels against the arms race and deployment of new US nuclear missiles in Western Europe. It is held on the initiative of the British peace movement, and anti-war organisations from the Netherlands, France, Spain, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and other countries participate in it.

April 19-22

—A session of the Presidential Committee of the World Peace Council takes place in Havana, attended by 85 national delegations and delegations of public and national liberation movements. The agenda includes measures to step up joint struggle for peace and detente, and against the arms race and the war danger, and a discussion of the situation in Latin America.

April 23-25

—Sheikh Sabah al-Ahmad al-Jaber al-Sabah, Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Kuwait, pays an official visit to the Soviet Union. The Joint Soviet-Kuwaiti Communique says the exchange of views on the situation in the Gulf area revealed the closeness of opinions held by the parties on ways of achieving peace and security in the region. Both sides voiced support of the right of the Gulf states to safeguard the security

of the region without outside interference and to freely dispose of their natural resources. The two countries are against the establishment of foreign military bases and siting of nuclear weapons in the area, and against any outside interference in the internal affairs of the Gulf states.

April 24-26

—The fourth session of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues takes place in Geneva. It discusses limitation on medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe, complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, the impact of new technology on security and the arms race, and other issues. Much attention is paid to Soviet disarmament proposals made at the 26th Congress of the CPSU, notably the suggested moratorium on deployment in Europe of new medium-range nuclear weapons. The Commission appealed to the USA and the USSR to start negotiating limitation of these weapons in Europe without further delay.

April 27

—The Soviet Ambassador to the United Nations handed Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim a letter from USSR Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko concerning the Second Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament.

April 27-29

—Colonel Muammar al-Gaddafi, leader of the Libyan Revolution and head of the Popular Socialist Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, pays an official visit to the USSR. The Joint Soviet-Libyan Communique says that the sides exchanged views on certain problems concerning the situation in the Mediterranean, emphasised the importance of preserving peace and security in this vulnerable area at the junction of the three continents, Europe, Asia and Africa, and stressed that security in the European continent is closely linked with security in the Me-

diterranean. The USSR and Libya support the proposals for making Africa and the Middle East, along with Latin America, nuclear-free zones, and to create peace zones in the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean and in Southeast Asia.

May 4-7

—UN Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim pays an official visit to the USSR. On May 5, he is received by Leonid Brezhnev, who explained the cardinal foreign policy initiatives advanced by the 26th Congress of the CPSU. The general purpose of these initiatives, he noted, is in harmony with the goals and principles of the UN Charter.

May 5

—The Madrid CSCE follow-up meeting resumes its sessions after a recess of three weeks.

May 9

—TASS issues a Statement containing an analysis and appraisal of the NATO Council session held in Rome on May 4-5. The Statement points out that the peaceable rhetoric and vague formulations of the session's Communique are a camouflage concealing aggressive intentions.

May 12-17

—President and Premier of the People's Republic of the Congo and Chairman of the Congolese Party of Labour, Denis Sasson-Nguesso pays an official friendly visit to the Soviet Union. A Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation between the Soviet Union and Congo is signed on May 13. In the Joint Soviet-Congolese Communique the sides resolutely condemned the increased military and political interference of the USA and some other NATO countries in the affairs of African countries.

*May 14-
July 23*

—The 24th round of the talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe takes place in Vienna.

May 20-25

—Mexican Foreign Minister Jorge H. Castañeda pays an official visit to the USSR. The Joint Soviet-Mexican Communique says that both governments have common or close views on some of the key issues of today. It called for energetic action by all states to lessen the war danger, and so safeguard peace and international security. The Mexican side expressed the opinion that the peace initiatives of the 26th Congress of the CPSU merit most thorough consideration by the international community.

May 22

—Leonid Brezhnev speaks at a meeting in Tbilisi on the 60th anniversary of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Communist Party of Georgia. Speaking on international affairs, Leonid Brezhnev referred to Middle East problems, in particular the situation in the Persian Gulf and around Afghanistan: "How to defuse the situation? We see several options: to negotiate peace and security in the Persian Gulf area separately and a settlement of the situation around Afghanistan separately, or to discuss the international aspects of both problems in combination. In either case, of course, the sovereignty of all the states in the area must be reliably ensured. . .

"An agreement securing a political settlement would enable us to, by agreement with the Afghan side, fix the date and procedure for the withdrawal from Afghanistan of Soviet troops. Non-resumption of intervention against Afghanistan would have to be reliable and guaranteed."

May 22

—The Arab League Council of Foreign Ministers holds an emergency session in Tunis to discuss the situation in the Middle East in connection with the barbaric bombing by the Israeli air force of villages and towns and Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon, and Tel-Aviv's provocations against Syria. The document of the session says: "In connection with the Israeli actions, Arab countries will provide Syria all necessary assistance to counter aggression, and will commit all their strength, the armed forces included, in the struggle in keeping with the Charter of the Arab League and the Treaty on Joint Defence. The Council declares its support of the unity, independence and sovereignty of Lebanon and of its lawful Central Government.... The Council has adopted a resolution on all-round assistance to the Palestine Liberation Organisation."

May 26-29

—King Hussein ibn Talal of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan pays an official friendly visit to the USSR. The thorough exchange of opinions concerned the situation in the Middle East and the ways of establishing just and stable peace in the region.

June 1

—Heads and representatives of churches and religious organisations of the Soviet Union meet in St. Sergius' Trinity Monastery. The conference was called on the initiative of the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia Pimen. It adopts an appeal to all religious leaders and all believers concerning disarmament and the strengthening of peace.

June 1-3

—The 12th Conference of the Foreign Ministers of Islamic states gathers in Baghdad. It focusses attention mainly on the Jerusalem problem, Palestinian question, the situation in Lebanon and the armed conflict between Iran and Iraq.

June 4

—The heads of state of Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Norway and Iceland meet in Harpsund, the summer residence of Sweden's Prime Minister, to discuss a range of international political and economic problems, and specifically the problem of making Northern Europe a nuclear-free zone.

June 4

—A National Council for Peace, Democracy and Unity of Progressive Forces is set up in Tokyo. Its constituent assembly is attended by 325 delegates representing all prefectures and the 3.9 million members of the nearly 1,000 public organisations of Japan.

June 6-8

—An International Conference, "Against the Arms Race and For Disarmament in Europe", held in Stockholm, attended by 160 representatives of 85 national organisations and movements from 30 European countries, the United States and Canada, and of 13 international organisations.

June 8-10

Chadli Bendjedid, President of the Algerian People's Democratic Republic and General Secretary of the National Liberation Front pays an official friendly visit to the USSR. In a Joint Soviet-Algerian Communique the Soviet Union and Algeria express "their resolve to continue to work for the preservation and strengthening of peace and international security, and the consolidation of detente by extending it to all regions of the world".

June 10

—TASS issues a Statement on the Israeli bombing of the nuclear research centre in Baghdad on June 7. The Statement says among other things that "the bandit raid by Israeli aviation on the capital of Iraq is resolutely condemned in Soviet leading circles, and they hold that responsibility for it is borne by Israel and the United

States of America which arms the aggressor and gives it every support”.

June 10-11

—The Arab League Council of Foreign Ministers holds an emergency meeting in Baghdad. The participants resolutely condemned the Israeli air raid on the Iraqi nuclear research centre, and called on all countries to apply sanctions against Israel in accordance with the UN Charter.

*June 11-
August 22*

—The summer session of the Disarmament Committee gathers in Geneva. The socialist countries call for immediate negotiations of a draft international convention banning production, stockpiling, deployment and use of nuclear and neutron weapons, and propose that a special working group be set up for this purpose. Though the proposals were received with interest, they were not approved owing to obstructions by the USA and its NATO allies.

June 12-14

—The Fifth Meeting of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues is held in Moscow. The Commission speaks out unanimously for the maintenance of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems signed in 1972. The issue gained relevance because voices had resounded overseas that the Treaty should be revised or even annulled. In the opinion of the Commission the Treaty is basic to the strategic stability needed for the continuation of the strategic arms limitation process. On June 12 Olof Palme, Chairman of the Commission, is received by Leonid Brezhnev. They discuss matters related to the work of the Commission. On the same day Andrei Gromyko meets former US Secretary of State

Cyrus Vance and Britain's former Foreign Secretary David Owen, who are both members of the Commission.

June 14-16

—Belgian Foreign Minister Charles-Ferdinand Nothomb pays an official visit to the USSR. The Soviet-Belgian Communique stresses that “relating to the present deterioration of the international situation the Sides find it necessary to exert every effort to surmount tension, display restraint, a spirit of mutual understanding and respect for each other's interests”. /

June 16

—India protests against the US decision to sell up-to-date weapons to Pakistan, which could upset the balance in the region and undermine efforts to normalise relations between India and Pakistan (on June 15 it was announced that the USA and Pakistan agreed on military supplies and economic aid worth more than three billion dollars over a period of five years).

June 19

—The UN Security Council extends the mandate of the UN peace-keeping force in Lebanon.

June 20

—A large-scale demonstration of peace supporters is held in Hamburg, with nearly 100,000 people taking part.

June 23

—The USSR Supreme Soviet unanimously adopts an Appeal to the Parliaments and Peoples of the World.

June 27

—The press publishes Leonid Brezhnev's replies to the Finnish newspaper *Suomen Sosialidemokraatti* concerning a nuclear-free zone in Northern Europe. Brezhnev

stresses that the Soviet Union has already stated its positive attitude to the proposal, and would be prepared to undertake not to use nuclear weapons against countries in the North European zone. "Nor do we rule out the possibility of considering some other measures applicable to our own territory in the region adjoining the nuclear-free zone in the North of Europe," Brezhnev says. "The Soviet Union is prepared to discuss this question with the countries concerned."

June 29

—The People's Great Khural of the Mongolian People's Republic issues an Appeal to the Parliaments of the Asian and the Pacific Countries. The Appeal says that the Mongolian People's Republic supports the proposals to make Southeast Asia and the Indian Ocean a zone of peace and co-operation; to establish a nuclear-free zone in the Pacific Ocean, and to institute confidence-building measures in the Far East. The Appeal recalls that the Mongolian People's Republic recently advanced the idea of drafting and signing a convention on non-aggression and non-use of force in relations between Asian and Pacific states, and holding a conference of the above states to which the permanent members of the UN Security Council should be invited. The Appeal has been distributed as an official document of the UN General Assembly.

June 30

—Leonid Brezhnev receives Willy Brandt, Chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany and Chairman of the Socialist International. They agreed that the only reliable avenue to the solution of disputed international problems lies through serious negotiations based on a sincere desire of both sides to achieve positive results and readiness to contribute to this in conformity with the principle of equality and equal security.

Brezhnev and Brandt agree that contacts and exchanges of views between the CPSU and SDPG are im-

portant for Soviet-West German relations and for strengthening peace and international security.

July 6

—Andrei Gromyko has talks with British Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs Lord Carington, who pays a working visit to Moscow. A joint Soviet-British release states that “the business-like discussions concerned a range of current international and bilateral matters of mutual interest”. The ministers “expressed their intention to continue the dialogue”.

July 7

—The non-aligned nations’ committee for settling the Iran-Iraq conflict completes its work in Lusaka. Zambia, Cuba, India and the Palestine Liberation Organisation take part. It is agreed that committee members should visit Iraq and Iran to urge both sides to terminate the conflict.

*July
15-16*

—The Bureau of the Socialist International meets in Bonn, attended by leaders of socialist and social-democratic parties of more than 20 countries. The main topic discussed is the present state of East-West relations. Special attention is devoted to the situation ensuing from the NATO decision to deploy new US medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe.

*July
16-17*

—India’s Minister of External Affairs P. V. Narasimha Rao pays a short friendly visit to the USSR. The foreign ministers of the USSR and India hold talks. They stress that the Soviet-Indian Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation signed in 1971 is a sound foundation for Soviet-Indian relations, and works for peace and security in Asia.

July 22

—TASS issues a Statement in connection with the massive Israeli air raids and commando landings in Lebanon. The Statement says: "The leaders of Israel, defying world public opinion and ignoring all norms of international law, continue to broaden piracy and aggression actions against Arab peoples. The barbarous Israeli attacks on peaceful Lebanese towns and villages and Palestinian refugee camps by the Israeli military in recent days became another stage in that criminal escalation. . . Israel could not have behaved so defiantly and brazenly without feeling support, moreover—encouragement on the part of the United States of America."

July 24

—In conformity with the UN Security Council resolution, a cease-fire has come into force in Lebanon.

July 28

—The Madrid CSCE follow-up meeting adjourns until October 27.

*August
3-9*

—The International Conference for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons is held in Tokyo, Nagasaki and Hiroshima.

*August
5-7*

—A conference of non-governmental organisations on urgent measures against the arms race takes place in Geneva. Representatives of over 100 non-governmental organisations participate. They examine and discuss proposals and initiatives aimed at consolidating peace in Europe and in other continents.

August 6

—Peace March-81, which started in Copenhagen on June 22, ended in Paris on the day of the 36th anni-

versary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima. The Peace March was sponsored by women's organisations of North European countries seeking to make Europe a nuclear-free zone. The marchers covered more than 1,200 kilometres across Denmark, West Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium and France, organising mass meetings and demonstrations against the nuclear war danger and the deployment of US medium-range missiles in Europe along their route.

August 6

—The press publishes the message of greetings sent to participants in Peace March-81 by Leonid Brezhnev. "Your noble initiative," it says, "embodies the growing protest of the peoples of Europe against the danger of the West European countries becoming an arena of a destructive nuclear war. The Soviet people followed the Peace March with deep interest and sympathy."

August 10-11

—The press publishes comments on the announcement on August 9 that US President Ronald Reagan had given the go-ahead for full-scale production of neutron weapons (on August 6). Reagan's decision, a threat to world peace, was received with alarm and anger in many countries, including NATO states. China was the only country that dared voice its approval. As reported from Oslo, Stockholm, New York, Bonn, Tokyo and other cities, the decision triggered public protests everywhere. The Norwegian government issued an official protest. The decision was denounced by Prime Minister of India, Indira Gandhi, Danish Prime Minister Anker Jørgensen, and statesmen, politicians and public personalities of various countries. Political expert of the SDPG faction in the Bundestag, Egon Bahr, said he was convinced that the very idea of creating a neutron bomb that destroys millions of human beings and leaves property intact must be the fruit of a perverted mind.

August 12

—The draft of a treaty prohibiting the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space, initiated by the Soviet Union, is published. On the following day Andrei Gromyko submits it to the UN, and suggests that it should be entered in the agenda of the coming 36th UN General Assembly.

August 14

—TASS issues a Statement in connection with the decision of the US Administration to start the production of neutron weapons. The Statement stresses that the USSR has repeatedly urged negotiations on mutual renunciation and prohibition of neutron weapons. "The Soviet leadership is convinced, as before," it says, "that this solution corresponds best to the task of strengthening peace and meets the interests of all states and peoples.

"At the same time, let there be no doubt in anyone's mind," the Statement continues, "that in face of the steps taken by the United States, the Soviet Union will evaluate the developing situation accordingly, and take requisite measures to ensure its security and that of its friends and allies."

August 15

—A ten-day National Peace Cruise starts from Rotterdam along the rivers and canals of the Netherlands to Amsterdam. Its participants, Dutch peace movement activists, send a petition to the country's Parliament protesting against the US President's plans of producing neutron weapons and demanding an end to the nuclear arms race.

August 20

—In Aden, leaders of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Libya and Ethiopia sign a treaty of friendship and co-operation envisaging political, economic and other co-operation of the three countries.

August 21

—The trade unions of West Germany, numbering nearly 8 million members, publish *An Appeal for Peace*, containing a programme of struggle for peace and disarmament. They also announced that on Anti-War Day, September 1, they would start collecting signatures under this Appeal.

August 23

—The press reports that the CPSU Central Committee's Political Bureau discussed the results of Leonid Brezhnev's meetings with leaders of fraternal parties and socialist countries in the Crimea in July and August. The CPSU Central Committee document states that "a reasonable and just solution of controversial international problems is possible, but the language of force or threats of force is not suited for this". The socialist countries, the document says, "are ready for dialogue and co-operation with all forces disturbed by the present international situation and want to buttress international security."

August 24

—The government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan issues a Statement concerning a political settlement of the situation over Afghanistan, containing new constructive initiatives.

August 26

—The summit meeting of the member-states of the Special Committee of the Organisation of African Unity on Western Sahara ends its work in Nairobi (Kenya). Participants endorse a plan envisaging a cease-fire and a referendum on the self-determination of Western Sahara under the auspices of the UN and OAU.

August 27

—In the UN Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, the USA, West Germany and Australia invoke the rule of consensus to turn down all proposals for holding an

early conference to draw up an international convention making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. The obstructionism of NATO member-countries blocked the General Assembly resolution to hold the conference in 1981.

August 27

—A demonstration against the US militarist policy and the decision to produce neutron bombs is held outside the White House in Washington. The demonstration was sponsored by the coalition for nuclear disarmament.

August 31

—The UN Security Council votes on the resolution condemning South Africa for its military attack on Angola—the largest since 1975 (on August 24-25 South African troops launched a massive invasion of Angola's southern districts). Thirteen Security Council members voted for the resolution. A US veto scuttled the resolution. The British delegate abstained.

September 1

—International Peace Day. Mass meetings and demonstrations take place in many cities of the world under the slogan, "To Safeguard Peace Is the Main Task".

*September
4-14*

—An emergency session of the UN General Assembly on Namibia is held in New York. A resolution approved by an overwhelming majority stresses that the Security Council Resolution 435, providing for free elections in Namibia and the country's transition to independence under international inspection, is the only possible basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem.

September 7

—Leonid Brezhnev meets Le Duan, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam, in Moscow. In a statement issued after the meeting the sides stress that

“US militarist policies and Chinese hegemonic ambitions have aggravated world tension, especially in South-east Asia. The peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea are at present deprived of a chance to devote all their energy to peaceful activity and constructive tasks. Their security is threatened by continuous Peking-inspired sallies supported by the US Administration. China and the USA are exerting pressure on the ASEAN countries to declare a political and economic boycott. The Soviet Union and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam hold, the statement says, that consolidation of security in Asia should become the common/objective of the Asian states.

September 7

—The USSR Embassy in Madrid hands the Foreign Ministry of Spain a Memorandum on Spain's proposed accession to NATO. The admission of a new member to the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, the Memorandum says, would inevitably upgrade the confrontation of the two politico-military alliances in Europe.

*September
8-9*

—A meeting of representatives of Peace Committees of the socialist countries of Asia (Nakhodka, USSR), attended by representatives from Vietnam, Kampuchea, Laos, Mongolia, and the Soviet Union. Their joint statement emphasises the determination of public movements in the socialist countries of Asia to vitalise their actions against imperialism, hegemonism, intensification of the arms race, and to work for making the Asian continent a zone of peace and stability.

September 13

—The largest anti-war demonstration of the past few years takes place in West Berlin during Alexander Haig's visit to that city. More than eighty thousand marched through the city protesting against US policies, endangering world peace, against the arms race escalated by

the Reagan Administration, and specifically against the production of neutron bombs.

*September
14-18*

—The Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues holds a meeting in Mexico.

*September 15-
December 19*

—The 36th UN General Assembly is in session in New York.

September 17

—Leonid Brezhnev receives British Labour Party leader Michael Foot, who visits Moscow at the head of a Parliamentary Labour Party delegation. Brezhnev and Foot agree that the coming Soviet-American negotiations on the limitation of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe should be constructive in character and based on the principle of equality and equal security. They also agree on the need for resuming the strategic arms limitation process. Brezhnev expresses the opinion that "goodwill is the necessary condition for settling the problem of medium-range nuclear-missile weapons in Europe. The Soviet Union is not going to insist on keeping the number of its missiles deployed in its Western regions intact and would agree to their reduction, provided, of course, the Americans take a reasonable position and NATO withdraws its well-known decision". Michael Foot declares that the Labour Party is sharply critical of the decision to start production of the neutron bomb. Brezhnev and Foot emphasised the important role and responsibility of the labour movement, of all democratic forces, in the fight for peace.

September 19

—A mass demonstration in Washington, involving half a million Americans, comes out for civic rights, against

the policy of the Reagan Administration, and against the militarist budget.

September 23

—At the 36th UN General Assembly the Soviet Union requests the inclusion in the session agenda of "Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe: Declaration of the General Assembly". The Declaration says in part that "the states and statesmen first resorting to nuclear arms be declared guilty of committing a grave crime against humanity".

*September 24-
December 10*

—The 25th round of the talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe is held in Vienna.

*September
24-25*

—The Socialist International Bureau meets in Paris. A special resolution says that the Socialist International welcomes the efforts to establish nuclear-free zones, specifically in the Pacific Ocean and in Northern Europe; comes out in favour of convening a conference on military detente in Europe, and calls for early resumption of the SALT process.

September 25

—A Joint Soviet-American Statement is issued, saying that in the course of the meeting which took place in New York on September 23, Andrei Gromyko and Alexander Haig exchanged views on questions relating to limitation of arms. They agreed that it was necessary to hold serious talks concerning nuclear arms, and on behalf of their governments arranged to start them at ambassadorial level on November 30, 1981. Gromyko and Haig met again on September 29 and agreed that the exchange of views would be continued at ministerial level at the beginning of 1982.

September 27

—The Perugia-Assisi peace march is held in Italy. Over 70,000 marchers take part, protesting against the deployment of US nuclear missiles in Italy. Greetings sent to the marchers by Leonid Brezhnev evoked broad response. In his message Brezhnev said: "In the struggle to bridle the arms race and eliminate the war danger, the Soviet Union will continue to go along with all those who act for peace, international security and co-operation."

*September 28-
October 25*

—A Youth Relay for Peace takes place in France. It started simultaneously in Saint-Brieuc, Toulouse and Ajaccio, and ended in Paris.

*September
28-29*

—A second session is held by the preparatory committee for a World Conference, Dialogue on Problems of Disarmament and Detente to be held on January 29-February 1, 1982, in Vienna.

October 2

—The 80th conference of the British Labour Party ends in Brighton. It declares against the stationing of US nuclear missiles and neutron or any other nuclear weapons on British soil, and against plans to fit out British submarines with US Trident missiles. The conference demands that the next Labour government dismantle all nuclear bases, both British and American, in Britain.

October 8-13

—The World Congress of Women, held in Prague, is attended by over 1,000 delegates representing women's movements of 130 countries, and 88 international organisations. The motto of the Congress: "Equality, National Independence, Peace."

October 10

—The biggest anti-war demonstration in the history of the Federal Republic of Germany is held in Bonn, involving more than 250,000 people. They protest against the arms race and demand that the Federal government withdraw its consent to deploy new US nuclear missiles in the FRG.

*October
12-17*

—The 28th Plenary Assembly of the World Federation of United Nations Associations is held in Geneva, attended by representatives of 45 national associations. Among other things, the Assembly discussed the subject "Security through Disarmament!" and "Role of WFUNA and UNAs in Connection with UN Second Special Session devoted to Disarmament".

October 15

—A demonstration of 150,000 is held in Madrid against Spain's accession to NATO and for peace.

October 17

—At talks with US Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger in Stockholm, Swedish Prime Minister Thorbjörn Fälldin and Foreign Minister Ola Ullsten tell the chief of the Pentagon that the US decision to produce neutron bombs is highly alarming and is regarded as opening a new and dangerous stage of the nuclear arms race.

October 21

—Leonid Brezhnev answers a question by a *Pravda* correspondent. He says that "only he can start a nuclear war in hopes of emerging the victor in it who has made up his mind to commit suicide. However strong the attacker and whatever method of unleashing nuclear war he might choose, he will not be able to achieve his ends. Retribution will inevitably follow.

"This is our principled stand. It would be a good thing if the President of the United States too made a clear

and unequivocal statement rejecting the very idea of a nuclear attack as criminal.”

October 24-27

—The Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues meets in Paris. Its Chairman, Olof Palme, stresses the immense danger of the concept that a “limited” nuclear war, specifically in Europe, is thinkable. (On October 16, Ronald Reagan said at a meeting with editors of US provincial newspapers that there could be an “exchange of nuclear strikes” in Europe with tactical nuclear weapons, meaning that a “limited” nuclear war on the European continent is possible. This statement aroused the indignation of political and public quarters in the Federal Republic of Germany, Great Britain and other countries of Western Europe.)

*October
24-31*

—A Disarmament Week is held under the auspices of the United Nations and the World Peace Council. Powerful mass anti-war actions were held in many cities throughout the world, including London (over 250,000 participants), Rome (nearly 150,000), on October 24, and Paris (over 100,000) and Brussels (nearly 200,000) on October 25.

October 27

—The Madrid CSCE follow-up meeting reopens in Madrid.

November 1

—Massive peace demonstrations are held in Hannover, Frankfurt-on-Main (FRG); Ottawa, Toronto, Montreal (Canada); and in many cities of Portugal.

November 3

—Leonid Brezhnev answers questions of the West German magazine, *Der Spiegel*. Brezhnev declares the Soviet Union’s firm resolve to defend and strengthen peace.

The USSR stands for any honest talks leading to the curbing of the arms race and to genuine disarmament—this was the main point made in the comments on Brezhnev's answers abroad.

November 11

—A Day of Struggle against the Threat of Nuclear War is held in the USA. Scientists, physicians, clergymen and public personalities speak at meetings in 147 universities and colleges.

November 12

—Dimitrios Maroudas, the Greek government's spokesman, says at a press conference concerning the Soviet-Bulgarian proposals to establish a nuclear-free zone in the Balkans that the government of Greece would be willing to discuss the matter and hopes that a relevant agreement will be signed. He added, that Greece will start the removal of nuclear weapons from its territory even unilaterally, irrespective of the position taken by other Balkan states.

*November
16-19*

—Representatives of European Christian Churches meet in Løgumkloster (Denmark) under the auspices of the Conference of European Churches and the European Council of Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church. The Metropolitan Alexyi of Tallinn and Estonia, who headed the delegation of churches of the USSR, said that "the meeting is a strong stimulus for churches and Christians in Europe to invigorate their effort in the struggle for peace and disarmament".

November 19

—The world press publishes first comments on the pronouncement of Ronald Reagan on November 18 at the National Press Club in Washington, which was advertised beforehand as an important foreign-policy initiative

of the Administration. (Reagan said that the USA is prepared to give up the plan of deploying new US nuclear cruise missiles and Pershing-2 missiles in Europe in 1983, provided the Soviet Union destroys all its medium-range SS-20 missiles along with the SS-4 and SS-5. The "proposal" had long been planned by NATO under the name, zero option). The press and political and public figures regard Reagan's move as no more than a "propaganda ploy" aimed at "dampening the flames of anger over the reckless US nuclear policy" and an "attempt to deceive the world public", which is calling for an end to the nuclear arms race initiated by Washington. Comments stressed that the purpose of Reagan's move was to upset the rough parity in arms levels in favour of the USA, and pressure the USSR to destroy its medium-range missiles in exchange for the US offer not to deploy new, as yet unproduced nuclear missiles in Western Europe.

November 21

—A large-scale demonstration in defence of peace and against the US-initiated nuclear arms race is held in Amsterdam. About 500,000 people, including members of political parties, trade unions, and public, youth and religious organisations of the Netherlands, Belgium, Britain, West Germany, the United States and other countries, take part.

November 22-25

—Leonid Brezhnev pays a visit to the Federal Republic of Germany. In the course of the Soviet-West German talks, the sides reviewed important international issues concerning Europe and the rest of the world, and also the present state and future outlook of bilateral relations. The sides stated their intention to continue dialogue and contacts.

Brezhnev's speeches in the FRG contained far-reaching proposals to achieve mutually acceptable accords and

safeguard Europe from nuclear conflagration. The proposals were addressed not only to West Germany and other West European countries, but also to the United States in connection with the Soviet-American talks on the limitation of medium-range nuclear arms in Europe to be held in Geneva on November 30. The Soviet Union, Brezhnev pointed out, "is for relieving Europe of all nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical. That would be a real 'zero option' fair to all sides."

November 28

—A demonstration in Florence (Italy) against the arms race and NATO plans involved 200,000 people from all parts of Italy.

November 28-30

—A European Conference "Women of Europe for Peace", sponsored by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, is held in Amsterdam, attended by delegations of 25 nations. It approved a plan of joint actions and an appeal to the Preparatory Committee of the Second Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament.

November 29

—Speaking in Vatican's St. Peter's Square, Pope John Paul II says that he has sent personal messages to Leonid Brezhnev and Ronald Reagan in support of the coming Geneva talks, so that through joint goodwill efforts the talks would achieve results buttressing hope in a future without the spectre of nuclear conflict.

November 29

—The American Committee on East-West Accord sends a letter to Ronald Reagan urging him to renounce plans of a "limited" nuclear war. The letter is signed by former Senators John C. Culver, James W. Fulbright, Jacob K. Javits, former Under-Secretary of State George

W. Ball, economist J. Kenneth Galbraith, retired Admiral Noel A. M. Gayler, former US Ambassador to the USSR George Kennan, former Secretary of the Army Stanley R. Resor, and many others.

November 30

—As agreed, Soviet-American talks on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe begin in Geneva. The heads of the two delegations, Soviet Ambassador Yuli Kvitsinsky and US Ambassador Paul Nitze, meet.

*December
1-2*

—The Warsaw Treaty Foreign Ministers Committee meets in Bucharest.

*December
1-3*

—The Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues meets in Tokyo. It discusses the draft of a report and recommendations to be submitted by it to the Second Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament.

December 6

— A large anti-war demonstration is held in Athens. Tens of thousands of people marched to the capital under the slogan, "For a Greece Free of Missiles, Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Bases".

December 9

—The UN General Assembly adopts 49 resolutions on disarmament. Among them are resolutions of great political importance such as one on the Soviet proposal for the conclusion of a treaty banning the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space, a declaration submitted by the USSR on the prevention of nuclear catastrophe, and a resolution calling for the banning of neutron weapons submitted by the GDR on behalf of the socialist countries.

December 11

—Prime Minister of Greece Andreas Papandreu says on Athens television that the country suspends some of the provisions of the 1980 agreement on its re-entry of NATO's military organisation.

December 11-13

—General Secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and Chairman of the GDR Council of State Erich Honecker and FRG Chancellor Helmut Schmidt hold talks in the GDR. As noted in the Communique, the sides are determined to work actively for the promotion of detente, ensuring lasting peace and stability. They spoke out for consistent continuation of the process initiated by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and for strict observance of the Quadripartite Agreement on West Berlin, which is an essential factor of detente in Europe.

December 14

—The UN Security Council extends for another six months, till June 15, 1982, the mandate of the UN interim peace-keeping force in Cyprus, stationed there since 1964.

December 15

—The press publishes a TASS Statement on the latest events in Poland (on December 13 the Polish State Council decreed martial law and established the Military Council of National Salvation). The Statement says: "All these steps are, of course, Poland's internal affair. Any other interpretations of these events made by certain quarters in the West cannot be considered as anything but an attempt to interfere in affairs which are within the competence of the Poles themselves."

December 15

—Leonid Brezhnev receives a group of scholars from the Pontifical Academy of Science at the request of Pope

John Paul II, head of the Roman Catholic Church and the Vatican City State. The members of the group present Brezhnev with a copy of the Declaration on the Consequences of the Use of Nuclear Weapons containing the results of research done by the Academy.

Leonid Brezhnev stresses that, as ever, the dominant factor of Soviet foreign policy is the aim of preserving peace, averting the danger of nuclear war, and strengthening international security. In the field of international contacts and dialogue aimed at improving the world's political climate for all states, big, medium, and small, there is enough room for all political, public, scientific, religious and other forces pursuing pacific goals.

Representatives of the Pontifical Academy of Science agreed that the present situation called for a broad mobilisation of peace-loving forces in the effort to safeguard peace and the security of nations.

December 15

—Ronald Reagan receives the group of scholars from the Pontifical Academy of Science. Members of the group hand Reagan a copy of the Declaration on the Consequences of the Use of Nuclear Weapons.

The head of the group said later that the President had listened to the scientists' opinion on the subject but "gave no promises to take concrete actions". The head of the group emphasised that Reagan did not concur that nuclear war was unwinnable.

December 15

—In New York, UN Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim receives the group of scholars from the Pontifical Academy of Science, who hand him the Declaration on the Consequences of the Use of Nuclear Weapons.

December 15-17

—The World Trade Union Conference on Social and

Economic Aspects of Disarmament is held in Paris, attended by delegates from 62 countries.

December 17

—The UN Security Council adopts a resolution condemning Tel-Aviv's annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights occupied since 1967, and declares invalid under international law the decision to place the area under Israeli jurisdiction. It demanded that Israel should repeal this decision of the Israeli Knesset (Parliament) of December 14.

December 17

—The Soviet-American talks on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe in Geneva are adjourned until January 12, 1982.

December 18

—The UN Security Council decides to extend for another six months, till June 19, 1982, the mandate of the UN interim force in Lebanon.

December 19

—TASS issues a statement "In Connection with Ronald Reagan's Pronouncements on the Events in Poland". President Reagan's utterances at a Washington press-conference on December 17 are described as one more act of interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state. TASS said, among other things, that the US President presented matters as though they did not concern Poland's internal affairs, as though the decisions were not taken by Poland's leaders, and as though they were inspired and sanctioned by the USSR. It looks as though Reagan is looking for a pretext to aggravate tension, and to turn the internal crisis in Poland into an international one, to use the Polish events as an excuse for continuing Washington's militarist programmes. The TASS Statement published on December 30 in connection with Reagan's further pronouncements on the events in Po-

land stressed that "for no valid reason, defying the facts, the US President places on the USSR the responsibility for the introduction of martial law in Poland". The Statement also says that the importunately repeated set of fabrications about the Soviet Union is needed by the President to justify the "sanctions" he imposed against the USSR, which lead to a further deterioration in Soviet-American relations.

December 19

—The Madrid CSCE follow-up meeting adjourns until February 9, 1982.

December 22

—Leonid Brezhnev replies to questions of the American NBC television company. They deal with such topical issues as the Soviet-American talks on the limitation and reduction of nuclear arms in Europe, the prospects of a summit meeting between the leaders of the USSR and the USA, means of averting a confrontation between the two powers, disarmament, and limitation and reduction of strategic arms as being the most powerful and dangerous.

Brezhnev's replies contain a constructive programme which, if implemented, would greatly improve the political climate, and lower the level of the military confrontation. The interview generated a flow of interested comment.

December 31

—The CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the USSR send New Year's greetings to the Soviet people, saying, among other things, that "the two aims, those of building communism and of safeguarding world peace, have always been and remain for us the loftiest ones of all. The Party and the Government are doing their utmost to safeguard the peaceful life of the Soviet people. They consistently follow a policy of friend-

ship and co-operation among peoples, resolutely repulse the designs of the reactionary forces, and work vigorously to curb the arms race and for disarmament. For the Soviet Union no other task is more noble and humane than that of saving humankind from the danger of nuclear catastrophe."

G. A. Ponomarev, Cand. Sc. (Hist.)

CHRONICLE OF MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES HELD BY SCIENTISTS FOR PEACE AND DISARMAMENT¹

APRIL 1980-DECEMBER 1981

April
10-13

1980

The Second Pugwash Workshop on the Current Crisis of Nuclear Forces in Europe (Geneva). Sponsored by the Pugwash Group of Switzerland. About 30 prominent scientists, politicians and public figures of 18 countries participated. They discussed the problems of nuclear armaments in Europe and the role of scientists in halting the arms race and maintaining peace.

April
15-16

Soviet-Austrian Symposium on the 25th Anniversary of the State Treaty Re-establishing an Independent and Democratic Austria (Moscow). Organised by the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and by the Academy's Institute of World Economy and International Relations. Twenty-nine reports and statements. The topics discussed concerned the State Treaty, Austria's permanent neutrality, and included historical background material; the history of the elaboration and conclusion of the Austrian State Treaty of 1955 and its significance in strengthening Austria's statehood and European security in general.

¹ The chronicle covers major international events in which Soviet scientists participated. A similar chronicle for the period from January 1979 through March 1980 may be found in *Peace and Disarmament. Academic Studies*, 1980.

April
19-20

Seminar "Religious Interests in Europe in the Struggle for Continued Detente" (Vienna). Held on the initiative of the International Institute for Peace, Vienna. About thirty participants represented ten European countries and a number of international religious organisations. The Christian Peace Conference and Kramerhaus, the West Berlin church organisation, took part in convening the seminar.

May 12-14

The 12th General Assembly of the World Federation of Scientific Workers (Berlin). Attended by 84 delegates of 25 countries and by eight representatives of five international organisations, the assembly discussed the question of preserving and consolidating the gains achieved in the fight for detente; arms limitation; and international security. The Assembly adopted an appeal calling on the scientific and technical community throughout the world to join efforts in supporting detente by actively promoting an atmosphere of trust between states, and effective disarmament measures.

May 19-20

The Fourth Soviet-Finnish Symposium (Tampere). The Symposium considered a number of topical issues of contemporary international relations. It was organised by the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in conjunction with the Finnish International Relations Institute. The five Soviet and 14 Finnish experts who participated in the Symposium discussed a wide range of issues, including the global outlook for detente, Europe and East-West relations, and the role of the Madrid meeting in the process of detente.

May 28-29

The Fourth Soviet-West German Conference on Relations between the USSR and the FRG (Yerevan). Or-

ganised by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of the USSR and the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences jointly with the Association of German Chambers of Industry and Commerce, the Eastern Committee of West German Economy and the West German Society for East European Studies. The agenda: the world economic and energy situation; the present stage of, and the outlook for, economic relations between the USSR and the FRG; the influence of the world political situation on Soviet-West German relations. The Conference demonstrated that the sides were interested in expanding economic, scientific and technical relations, including development of large-scale long-term co-operation in different fields, primarily energy and raw materials.

June
9-13

World Congress on Disarmament Education (Paris). Held on the UNESCO initiative. Attended by 132 delegates of 48 countries, 122 observers from 97 non-governmental organisations and 55 UNESCO member-states, nine representatives of UN agencies, and representatives of two international inter-governmental organisations and the Palestine Liberation Organisation. The agenda: development of education in support of disarmament (within the framework of both formal and informal education), and expansion of relevant research. The final report adopted dealt with the ten aspects of education in support of disarmament.

June 23-27.

World Forum of International Non-Governmental Organisations (Brussels). Organised by the Union of International Associations. Attended by representatives of 85 international non-governmental organisations (INGOs), 27 national and 23 regional non-governmental organisations, 10 international research centres, representatives of the United Nations and a number of

its specialised agencies, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the European Economic Community (EEC), the Organisation of American States (OAS), and the Council of Europe.

The agenda covered a wide range of issues concerning the place and role of non-governmental organisations in today's world. The discussion centred on problems of peace, detente and disarmament. Special attention was devoted to European security and co-operation, in particular co-operation of INGOs at European level.

July 2-6.

International Conference "Human Rights and Peace—Peace and Human Rights" (Warsaw). Prominent scientists, politicians and public figures of 30 countries participating in the Conference adopted an appeal to the peoples of the world to invigorate the movement for universal peace. The appeal pointed out that distinctions in ideology, social system and religious belief were no obstacle to joint struggle for peace and disarmament.

August
20-25.

The 30th Pugwash Conference (Breukelen, the Netherlands). The main topic of discussion was arms limitation, security and development. Scientists from 43 countries took part. The discussion showed that the participants concurred in that urgent launching of negotiations on medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe was a matter of prime importance. The Statement on the Danger of Nuclear War adopted by the Conference expressed deep concern over the increase of military expenditures in the world and stressed the recklessness of the new US plans for so-called limited nuclear war. A special group of physicians and medical researchers met during the Conference to draw up a statement on the consequences of nuclear war.

September
8-12.

General Assembly of the International Council of Scientific Unions (Amsterdam). At the Assembly, the delegation of Soviet scientists proposed an amendment to the Charter of the ICSU to the effect that the Council shall promote lasting peace and international security in the world. The amendment was adopted unanimously.

September
21-26.

The 8th Meeting of Marxist and Christian Scientists (Detroit, USA). The meetings have been held regularly since 1978 on the initiative of the International Institute for Peace, Vienna. The 8th Meeting, entitled "Search for Peace Irrespective of Ideological Differences", was organised by the International Institute for Peace, the Institute of Peace Studies of Vienna University, and the Centre for Peace and Conflicts Studies at Wayne State University (Detroit). About 70 representatives and observers from 11 countries participated in the meeting, mostly representing research centres and religious organisations.

The discussion concerned urgent issues of the present international situation, struggle against the growing threat of war and the arms race, relaxation of tension, disarmament, and military detente. The US Presidential Directive 59 on so-called limited nuclear war was discussed widely, and described by participants as a provocative step of the Carter Administration which increased the danger of war.

A message to the UN Secretary-General was adopted on the initiative of Soviet representatives, calling on the United Nations to contribute to peace and security, reducing the threat of war, disarmament, and peaceful settlement of conflicts.

September 29-
October 2.

International Seminar on Detente and Soviet-British Relations (Moscow). Sponsored by the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries and the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament. Prominent public figures, scientists and journalists of the two countries exchanged views on a number of international problems pertaining to detente and Soviet-British relations.

October
9-11

Sixth Soviet-Japanese Symposium "Peace and Security in Asia" (Moscow). Held on the initiative of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences and the Institute of US and Canadian Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences jointly with the Japanese Council for National Security. The agenda: the present international situation; the situation in Asia and the Pacific; the present state and the outlook for Soviet-Japanese relations.

October
11-12.

Pugwash Workshop on Averting Nuclear War—the Role of the Media. (Bad Deutsch-Altenburg, Austria), the first Pugwash seminar on the subject. Attended by about 30 scientists and media representatives. The main purpose: drawing the attention of the media to the problem of the prevention of a nuclear war.

October
27-31.

International Seminar "The Red Cross and Peace. Dissemination of Humanitarian Law" (Moscow). Organised by the Executive Committee of the Union of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies of the USSR in co-operation with the Scientific Research Council on Peace

and Disarmament. Attended by executive officers and experts of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and experts in humanitarian law. Soviet participants included representatives of the Union of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies of the USSR, the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament, the Institute of State and Law of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Moscow University, and senior officials of several departments of the Soviet Army and Navy.

The exchange of views yielded an outline plan for further intensifying the Red Cross movement for peace and disarmament.

*November
3-6.*

Meeting of the Standing Commission for Multilateral Co-operation of Scientific Organisations of Socialist Countries "European Security Studies" (Warsaw). Representatives of scientific organisations of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the GDR, Hungary, Poland, and the USSR discussed topical aspects of international relations in Europe. Special attention was devoted to the present state and future development of relations between European states with different socio-economic systems, taking into account the outlook for military detente.

*November
13-16.*

The 11th Congress of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers (Valletta, Malta). Attended by over 600 participants from 76 countries. Problems discussed: the right of humanity, nations and individuals to peace and security; the right of the peoples to determine their destiny; the new economic order, making for equitable international co-operation; human rights.

November
18-20.

Soviet-Indian Symposium "Soviet-Indian Co-operation and Problems of Peace and Security in Asia" (Tbilisi). Held on the initiative of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries. About 30 scientists, cultural and public figures participated in the symposium to discuss the international significance of Soviet-Indian co-operation; the imperialist policy of destabilising the situation in Asia and the tasks of the struggle for peace and detente; the non-aligned movement as an important factor furthering peace and detente; the situation in Southwest Asia and the tasks of the struggle for detente.

Participants pointed out the growing importance of Soviet-Indian relations as an important factor of peace and stability not only in the region, but also in Asia and the rest of the world.

December
9-12.

A Meeting of Experts on Philosophical Studies Aimed at Strengthening Peace (Paris). Held under UNESCO auspices. Fourteen experts from scientific centres and higher educational establishments in nine countries participated. Representatives of a number of international organisations attended as observers.

Besides philosophers, the invited experts included economists, sociologists, historians and lawyers. The participants discussed the following subjects: dialectics of peace; philosophical understanding of peace problems; elaboration of a positive approach to the concept of peace as a philosophical task of the eighties.

December
10-12.

Pugwash Symposium "New Weapons Systems and Criteria for Evaluating Their Dangers" (London). Sponsored by the Pugwash Group of Great Britain. Over 30 scientists and public figures from 16 countries attended.

January
15-17.

International Colloquium "Science and Disarmament" (Paris). Sponsored by the French Institute for International Relations. Over 100 prominent scientists, experts, public figures and politicians from different countries participated in the discussion on the militarisation of science and exposure of the forces obstructing prohibition of the development of new types and systems of nuclear weapons. Participants stressed the growing responsibility of scientists in face of the war danger and the continuing nuclear arms race.

January
23-24.

International Symposium "The Eighties: Prospects and Problems of Detente and Disarmament" (Turbin-Cherkol, Austria). Sponsored by the International Institute for Peace. Over 50 scientists and public figures from 18 countries and a representative of the UN Centre for Disarmament participated. Special attention was devoted to political and military detente in Europe.

March
10-11.

Meetings of the Berlin Regional Centre of the World Federation of Scientific Workers (WFSW). Discussed the current international situation and its implications for the development of science and the position of scientists. On behalf of the Centre an appeal was issued to the scientists of the world, calling on them to work for the halting of the arms race and for effective disarmament measures and prevention of nuclear war.

March
21-25.

The International Congress of Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (Washington, D.C.) Physicians

and medical researchers representing 11 countries discussed the nature and scale of the consequences of an eventual use of nuclear weapons. On the basis of medical and scientific research, the participants came to the unanimous conclusion that a nuclear war would spell inevitable disaster on an enormous scale for all mankind. The Congress adopted an appeal to the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR Leonid Brezhnev and to US President Ronald Reagan to make requisite efforts to prevent nuclear war and "rule out the very idea of using nuclear weapons in any form and on any scale". They also addressed appeals to the heads of all governments and to the United Nations.

April 1-3.

International Symposium on Topical Problems of Security and Detente in Europe. The Symposium was sponsored by the Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation jointly with the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament. Representatives of political parties, scientific circles and anti-war movements from 21 European countries and Canada participated.

April 2-4.

The 8th Pugwash Workshop on Chemical Warfare (Geneva). The participants discussed issues related to the elaboration of a chemical disarmament convention.

April 13-15.

The 42nd Meeting of the Executive Council of the World Federation of Scientific Workers (Budapest). The Executive Council is the governing body of the WFSW, an organisation embracing over 400,000 scientists of different countries. The Council discussed the topical issue of stepping up the struggle of scientists against the arms race, against the development of new weapons of mass destruction, for peace, detente and disarmament.

April 22-23.

Meeting of the Working Group of the Standing Commission for Multilateral Co-operation of Scientific Organisations of Socialist Countries "European Security Studies" (Prague). Representatives of seven institutes in six socialist countries doing research in contemporary international relations participated. The group examined the question of preparing a joint publication on military detente in Europe and discussed future activities of the Commission.

May 4-5.

International Conference "The Working Class and Problems of Anti-Monopoly Struggle" (Moscow). Organised by the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions (AUCCTU) and the Institute of the International Working-Class Movement of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Attended by scientists, representatives of the international working-class movement, and trade union leaders. The working people's struggle against the arbitrary rule of monopolies, against the arms race, and for peace, democracy and social progress was the main subject discussed. The Conference stressed that no task was more important than safeguarding peace: not only was the arms race fraught with the danger of war, but it also led to the exacerbation of crisis phenomena in the capitalist economy—unemployment, inflation—and to a decrease in real wages. Speakers showed the important role the working class is called upon to play in checking militarist forces, averting the danger of a nuclear holocaust, and preserving and deepening detente.

May 11-14.

The 2nd Soviet-US Symposium "Problems of Ensuring Peace and Security in East and Southeast Asia" (Pushchino, USSR). Leading authorities of the two countries on international relations in East and Southeast Asia participated in the Symposium organised by the Institute of Far Eastern Studies of the Academy of Sciences

of the USSR. They discussed the topic of developing political and economic co-operation and maintaining security in the region.

May 15-16.

International Seminar "East-West Relations in a New Phase" (Hernstein, Austria). The Seminar was devoted to East-West relations and some aspects of the peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems. The participating Austrian scientists, businessmen, and representatives of international institutes and organisations based in Vienna expressed their interest in active economic, scientific, technical, educational and cultural co-operation.

May 18-20.

International Seminar "The Constitution and Foreign Policy, Peace and Disarmament" (Moscow). Sponsored by the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries jointly with the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament. Nearly 40 participants discussed the link between foreign policy and constitutional provisions in the struggle for peace and disarmament.

May 22-25.

The Fourth Pugwash Workshop on the Resumption of Negotiations on Strategic Arms Limitation and Nuclear Forces in Europe (Geneva). The Workshop prepared a draft statement of the Executive Committee of the Pugwash Movement, containing an urgent appeal to resume the negotiations.

May 26-29.

Pugwash Symposium "The Future of the Pugwash Movement" (Rehovoth, Israel). Participants from 14 countries examined the basic aspects of the international Pugwash Movement activities, primarily the outlook for intensified efforts of scientists against nuclear war, and

for halting the arms race, and strengthening international peace and security.

June 9-10.

Soviet-Hungarian Scientific Symposium on Detente and Co-operation in Europe (Moscow). Sponsored by the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. The Symposium reviewed global and regional aspects of European security and co-operation, including global economic co-operation projects and their bearing on detente; multi-lateral institutional co-operation, its problems and prospects; the effects of the general deterioration of the international situation on the relations between the two systems of states in Europe; conflict situations outside Europe and European security; the correlation of unity and contradictions in the policy of West European states towards the East; the outlook for military detente; the main trends in the relations between the socialist and the capitalist countries of Europe until the mid-eighties.

June 19-20.

International Conference of Lawyers "Against the Threat of War, for Initiatives for Peace and Detente" (Moscow). Prominent lawyers and scientists from over 40 countries took part in the Conference, organised by the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries and the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament. They discussed topical issues of international relations and the role lawyers could play in the struggle for security and detente. The participants expressed deep concern over the deterioration of the international climate caused by aggressive militarist elements in the West, who are constantly intensifying the arms race. They pointed out, however, that war was not inevitable and that law should be a means of guaranteeing peace. The participants sent

a message to the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR Leonid Brezhnev and to US President Ronald Reagan.

June 24-26.

The 9th Conference of Directors and Representatives of International Relations Institutes of Europe, the US and Canada (Moscow). Representatives of 27 institutes in 19 countries took part in the Conference, sponsored by the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. European security (military and political aspects of detente) was the main subject discussed. The discussion concerned the process of detente: its achievements, difficulties, and delays; prospects for arms limitation and disarmament in Europe; the latest economic and political trends and their significance for future East-West relations. Views were exchanged on how to halt tension, military confrontation and stockpiling of nuclear weapons in Europe. The participants examined the premises and prospects of maintaining and deepening detente, further development of the European process of strengthening security, and expansion of all-round co-operation. Issues pertaining to the practical implementation of the foreign policy initiatives put forward by the 26th Congress of the CPSU to normalise the international climate and to strengthen world peace were considered.

June 28.

A meeting of Soviet and US scientists (Moscow). A delegation of the Committee of International Security and Arms Control of the US National Academy of Sciences headed by Professor M. Goldberger, Chairman of the Committee, and a delegation of the Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament led by its chairman, Academician N. N. Inozemtsev, discussed international security. The participants recognised the usefulness of similar meetings in the future.

August 28-
September 2.

The 31st Pugwash Conference (Banff, Canada). Over 130 scientists of 40 countries participated. "Search for Peace in a Crisis-ridden World" was the main subject. The scientists expressed concern over possible production of the neutron bomb and condemned the US doctrine making "limited" nuclear war thinkable.

September
4-5.

International Symposium "Scientists and Peace" (Bucharest). Scientists from 32 countries and representatives of four international organisations took part in the Symposium, held on the initiative of the Academy of Sciences of the Socialist Republic of Romania. Its main subject was the role of scientists in the struggle for peace. The participants called on scientists, intellectuals and all peoples of the world to unite their efforts and to co-operate more closely for the defence of peace.

September
16-18.

International Disarmament Seminar (Nairobi, Kenya). The main purpose of the Seminar, organised by the UN Centre for Disarmament, was to draw the attention of the world public to problems of military detente, to mobilise peoples for struggle for disarmament, to elaborate a set of measures for the maintenance of peace.

The participants also discussed the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, elaboration of multilateral disarmament agreements, regional security, and other questions.

September
18-20.

Congress of Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (Hamburg). Held on the initiative of a group of West German scientists and physicians in reply to the

NATO decision to station new US medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe, and to the US President's decision to begin the production of neutron weapons.

Over 1,500 physicians and scientists of the FRG and delegations of a number of other countries took part. Over 3,000 FRG medical students also participated.

The final document of the Congress advocates renunciation of NATO's Brussels nuclear decisions and calls for closer action unity of physicians in the struggle for peace.

September
21-26.

International Scientific Symposium on the Role of Mass Media in Education for Peace, Disarmament and the Observation of Human Rights (Vienna). Sponsored by the International Institute for Peace, Vienna, with UNESCO's assistance.

The representatives of 14 countries participating in the Symposium discussed the influence of mass media on the education of the rising generations in the spirit of peace.

Relevant proposals and recommendations to UNESCO were elaborated. Participants expressed their desire to further the co-operation of scientists and journalists in the struggle for disarmament, detente and peace.

September 27.

Symposium of scientists and public figures from Canada and the Soviet Union (Toronto). The discussion at the symposium was devoted to the most urgent current problems, primarily those of nuclear arms reduction and disarmament.

October 5-7.

Soviet-British Meeting "Conversation on Survival in the Nuclear Age" (Edinburgh). Sponsored by the Scotland-USSR Society and by the University of Edinburgh. Attended by scientists, politicians and public figures, ex-

perts in international relations and strategic armaments, environmentalists and physicians. On the agenda: limitation of nuclear armaments and prevention of nuclear war.

The final document stressed the need for maintaining an active political dialogue; the danger of the neutron weapon lowering the nuclear threshold, and condemned "limited nuclear war" concepts. The document called for a declaration categorically condemning first use of nuclear weapons, and urging agreement on medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe ensuring a lower level of military confrontation. Europe, like any other region of the world, the document emphasised, should not be regarded a theatre of nuclear warfare.

October 6-13.

Scientific Conference "International Politics in the Eighties" (Hamburg). Sponsored by the Institute of Politics and Economics (Haus Rissen), located in a Hamburg suburb. Over 250 participants represented political, scientific, military and industrial circles in the FRG; delegates of 12 countries attended. The discussion concerned the state of international relations, détente, disarmament, economic development, and co-operation.

October
13-16.

Soviet-African Scientific and Political Conference "For Peace and Social Progress" (Moscow). The Conference was sponsored by the Institute of African Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Representatives of 26 states and a number of international organisations took part.

The participants discussed the state and prospects of Soviet-African relations and exchanged views on the main aspects of economic and social development, and on the current international situation.

The Conference adopted a statement noting the fruit-

ful nature of the debate and the need to elaborate and adopt measures for social progress, disarmament and peace.

October
20-23.

Meeting of the Standing Commission for Multilateral Co-operation of Scientific Organisations of Socialist Countries "European Security Studies" (Prague). Attended by representatives of scientific organisations of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and the USSR and editors-in-chief and senior staff members of political journals in the member-countries of the Commission.

Urgent problems of international relations and European politics were discussed as well as the tasks of scientists in the light of the present aggravation of international tension. The Commission's work was examined, notably editorial work on a joint publication on military detente. A statement was adopted, calling on West European scholars in this responsible hour of European history "to take the side of reason and scientific knowledge against political obscurantism and insanity", and to explain to the public the need for improving the situation in Europe and the rest of the world.

October
22-26.

The 9th Meeting of Marxist and Christian Scholars (Madrid). Convened by the International Institute for Peace, Vienna, jointly with the University of Vienna and the Comillas Catholic University, Madrid. Attended by scholars from Spain, the USSR, Poland, Hungary, the GDR, Romania, Mexico, the USA, the FRG, and other countries.

The Meeting dealt with the ways of saving mankind from military violence and mass annihilation in the context of different ideologies. The participants favoured negotiations on security and disarmament.

October
28-30.

The Second Conference of Presidents of Academies of Sciences of Socialist Countries (Sofia). Representatives of Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the USSR and Vietnam took part. The participants discussed energy problems and the results of the comprehensive co-operation between academies of sciences of the socialist countries in different fields of research. They expressed serious concern over the imperialist escalation of the arms race and the threat of a nuclear conflict. They expressed support of all actions strengthening peace and utilising the achievements of science for the benefit of mankind. The idea of establishing an authoritative international committee of scientists for the prevention of nuclear war and uniting all efforts to this end was given wholehearted support.

An Appeal to the scientists of the world was adopted, calling on them to come out in defence of human values, world peace and social progress and against the arms race, for a constructive dialogue among states with a view to settling all controversial issues by negotiations and strengthening and continuing the policy of detente and peace.

November
16-17.

The 6th Soviet-British Round Table Meeting (Moscow). Organised by the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in conjunction with the Royal Institute of International Affairs. The discussion concerned Soviet-British relations, international economic problems, the deterioration of the international situation, and search for ways to normalise it.

The participants pointed out that ending stagnation in Soviet-British relations and their further constructive

development would serve the interests of peace in Europe and the rest of the world.

November
17-19.

The 13th Dartmouth Conference (Moscow). This regular conference of representatives of the Soviet and US public was organised by the Soviet Peace Committee and the Institute of US and Canadian Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. (The previous Conference was held on May 3-6, 1979, in Williamsburg, USA).

The discussion was devoted to Soviet-US relations, arms limitation, and prevention and settlement of international conflicts.

November
26-30.

Soviet-British Meeting of Social Scientists (Sochi, USSR). Sponsored by the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries and the British Quakers' Society.

It discussed Soviet-British relations in the context of European security. Despite different views on some issues, the participants agreed that the arms race had to be checked and the fight for peace and European security intensified.

December 7-9.

Indo-Soviet Symposium on International Relations in Asia (Delhi). Sponsored by the Indian Council of Social Science Research jointly with the Indian Institute of Defence Research and Analyses in the framework of the Permanent Indo-Soviet Joint Commission on Cooperation in Social Sciences. Soviet participants included representatives of the Institute of the World Economy and International Relations, the Institute of Oriental Studies, and the Institute of US and Canadian Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.

The discussion concerned the process of detente in Asia at the present stage; the situation in East, South, Southeast, and Southwest Asia, the Pacific and the Indian oceans; the Arab-Israeli conflict; doctrines of nuclear war and their influence on international relations. It was stressed that this type of dialogue between scientists was important in view of the prevailing international tension.

*December
11-13.*

Meeting of the Pugwash Movement (Geneva). Prominent scientists, politicians and public figures of many countries who participated in the meeting of the Executive Committee of the Pugwash Movement, the Fifth Pugwash Workshop on Nuclear Forces in Europe and the Second Workshop on Averting Nuclear War—the Role of the Media, examined the question of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, normalisation of the international situation, and better understanding between countries and peoples.

December 22.

A meeting of Soviet and foreign scientists on the social responsibility of scientists in the struggle for peace and disarmament (Moscow). Organised by the Board of Znaniye Society and the Central Committee of the Trade Union of Teachers and Scientists. The meeting marked the 35th anniversary of the World Federation of Scientific Workers, the largest international non-governmental organisation of scientists advocating mutual trust between peoples and co-operation of scientists for world peace.

The participants stressed the need for expanding co-operation between scientists of different countries in solving global problems, particularly that of halting the arms race and averting nuclear annihilation.

V. L. Shvetsov, Cand. Sc. (Law)

TO THE PARLIAMENTS AND PEOPLES OF THE WORLD

An Appeal by the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Concerned about the growth of the military danger and the unprecedented scale of the arms race, the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics appeals to the Parliaments and peoples of the world.

The Supreme Soviet of the USSR is making this Appeal on the 40th anniversary of the day the nazis attacked our homeland. Soviet people bow their heads to the undying memory of 20 million fellow-countrymen who fell in the war. The Second World War brought incalculable hardship and suffering to all mankind. We deeply revere the memory of all those who laid down their lives in the struggle against aggression, for peace on earth.

History has delivered a stern lesson. The peoples paid too dear a price for their failure to prevent war, to avert in time the threat which had hung over the world. We must not allow any repetition of the tragedy. Everything must and can be done to prevent another world war.

Our planet is already oversaturated with weapons of mass destruction. But their stockpiling continues, ever more sophisticated and destructive weapons are being developed. Launching pads are being prepared in Western Europe for hundreds of new nuclear missiles. Attempts are being made to accustom people to the criminal idea that use of nuclear weapons is permissible.

Political tension is being stepped up. Once again there is a calculated drive to achieve military superiority; the language of threats is being used. The right to intervene in the affairs of other countries and peoples is being openly claimed. And all this under the cover of the gross lie about a "Soviet military threat".

The Supreme Soviet of the USSR solemnly declares that the Soviet Union is not threatening anyone, that it does not seek confrontation with any state in the West or in the East. The Soviet Union has never sought and is not now seeking military superiority. It has never initiated and will not initiate new spirals of the arms race. There is no type of weapon it would not agree to limit or to ban on a mutual basis by agreement with other states.

The safeguarding of peace has been and remains the supreme aim of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. This is the aim of the Peace Programme for the 1980s adopted by the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It embraces measures for reducing both nuclear missile weapons and conventional arms, it contains proposals for settling existing and preventing new conflicts and crisis situations, it is imbued with the desire to deepen detente and develop peaceful co-operation between the countries of all continents. It expresses the readiness of the Soviet Union to conduct negotiations on all current issues of peace and security, to give close consideration to all constructive ideas of other states.

In our nuclear age, dialogue and negotiations are needed equally by all, just as all need peace, security and confidence in the future. There is now no other sensible method of solving disputed problems, no matter how acute or complex they may be, except by negotiation. No opportunity must be missed. Time will not wait!

Each day lost for negotiations increases the risk of a nuclear conflict. The solution of vital problems confronting each people and all peoples is being deferred. Time will not wait!

In our time all those who by their actions are encouraging the arms race and the further stockpiling in the world of weapons of mass destruction, all those who are advocating use of force to settle disputed issues between states or who are turning a blind eye to the dangers now threatening the world, are in fact pushing mankind towards the abyss.

The Supreme Soviet of the USSR appeals to the legislative bodies of all countries to speak out firmly in favour of negotiations leading to the prevention of another round of the nuclear arms race, in favour of honest and equal negotiations with no preconditions or attempts to dictate terms.

The Supreme Soviet of the USSR trusts that its Appeal will receive the consideration and attention which this most important and most burning issue of our time deserves. It firmly believes that the Parliaments

possess the requisite powers and authority to press effectively for the curbing of the arms race and for disarmament through negotiations. For its part, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR will continue to make its contribution to creating a climate conducive to the achievement of positive results at negotiations.

Peace belongs to all mankind, and in our time it is also the prime condition for its survival. Only through joint efforts can peace be maintained and reliably safeguarded.

*Moscow, Kremlin
June 23, 1981*

*The Supreme Soviet of the
Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics*

TO THE SECOND SPECIAL SESSION OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY

On behalf of the Soviet Union, on behalf of the 269 million Soviet people, I am addressing the General Assembly of the United Nations which has convened for its Second Special Session on Disarmament.

The Session is faced with great and responsible tasks. Its agenda includes a number of items of paramount importance.

But if we are to single out what is most important, most urgent, what now worries people in all parts of the globe, what preoccupies the minds of statesmen and public figures in many countries, it is concern for halting the build-up of ever more destructive types of weapons, ensuring a dramatic improvement in international relations and averting a nuclear disaster.

Concern for peace is the dominant feature of the Soviet Union's policy. We are convinced that no contradictions between states or groups of states, no differences in social systems, ways of life or ideologies and no transient interests can eclipse the fundamental need of all peoples—the need to safeguard peace and avert a nuclear war.

Today, as never before, purposeful, considered action is required of all states in order to achieve this lofty goal.

Guided by the desire to do all in its power to deliver the peoples from the threat of nuclear devastation and ultimately to exclude its very possibility from the life of mankind, the Soviet Government solemnly declares:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics assumes the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

This obligation shall become effective immediately, the moment it is made public from the rostrum of the UN General Assembly.

Why is the Soviet Union taking this step in conditions when the nuclear powers participating in the NATO grouping, including the United States, make no secret of the fact that their military doctrine does not rule out the possibility of the first use of nuclear weapons and is actually based on this dangerous premise?

In taking this decision, the Soviet Union proceeds from the indisputable fact, which plays a determining role in the present-day international situation, that should a nuclear war begin, it could mean the destruction of human civilisation and perhaps the end of life itself on earth.

Consequently, the supreme duty of leaders of states conscious of their responsibility for the destinies of the world is to exert every effort to ensure that nuclear weapons never be used.

The peoples of the world have the right to expect that the decision of the Soviet Union will be followed by reciprocal steps on the part of the other nuclear states. If the other nuclear powers assume an equally precise and clear obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, that would be tantamount in practice to a ban on the use of nuclear weapons altogether, which is espoused by the overwhelming majority of the countries throughout the world.

In the conduct of its policy the Soviet Union will, naturally, continue to take into account how the other nuclear powers act, whether they heed the voice of reason and follow our good example or push the world downhill.

It is also the objective of the Soviet Union's initiative to raise the degree of trust in relations between states. And that is particularly important in the present-day international situation, where trust has been gravely crippled by the efforts of those who try to upset the obtaining balance of forces, to gain military superiority over the Soviet Union and its allies, and to wreck all the positive results of the policy of detente.

The military-political stereotypes inherited from the one-time monopoly on the atom bomb have become outdated. The realities of today require a fundamentally different approach to the questions of war and peace. The present move of the Soviet Union makes it easier to take a different look at the entire complex of problems related to the limitation and reduction of armaments, especially nuclear weapons, and furthers the cause of disarmament as a whole.

The vast achievements scored by human creative and technological genius permit the peoples to open a new chapter in their history. Boundless opportunities exist already now to approach the solution of such human problems of global magnitude as the struggle against hunger, disease, poverty, and many others. But that requires scientific and technological progress to be used exclusively to serve people's peaceful aspirations.

In assuming an obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union is confident in the power of sound judgement and believes in mankind's ability to avoid self-annihilation and to ensure peace and progress for the present and coming generations.

I would like further to invite the attention of the representatives of states attending the Special Session of the UN General Assembly to the following question.

In the search for measures which would actually halt the arms race many political and public figures of various countries have recently turned to the idea of a freeze, in other words, of stopping a further build-up of nuclear potentials. The considerations advanced in this connection are not all in the same vein. Still, on the whole, we believe they go in the right direction. We see in them the reflection of people's profound concern for their future. To use a figure of speech, people are voting for preserving the supreme value in the world, which is human life.

The idea of a mutual freeze of nuclear arsenals as the first step towards their reduction and, eventually, complete elimination, is close to the Soviet point of view. Moreover, our country has been the initiator of concrete proposals aimed at stopping the nuclear arms race in its quantitative and qualitative aspects.

And finally, there is still another issue which the UN General Assembly, in our view, cannot disregard.

Despite the obvious danger incident to nuclear weapons, it is not to be forgotten that there are other means of mass destruction in the arsenals of states, including chemical weapons. The fact, however unthinkable, is that a few kilograms of poisonous agents tens of thousands of tons of which are operational in the armies of certain countries are sufficient to kill several million people. In addition, new programmes are being launched for production of still more sophisticated lethal types of chemical weapons.

Everything should be done for the elimination of chemical weapons

from the face of the earth. The Soviet Union is a convinced champion of this approach. We are prepared to agree without delay on the complete prohibition of chemical weapons and destruction of their stockpiles.

On the whole, the Soviet Union is in favour of moving ahead in all areas where opportunities exist for limiting and radically reducing armaments, be it nuclear weapons, other types of mass destruction weapons or conventional armaments. There is no type of weapons which the Soviet Union would not be prepared to limit or ban on the basis of reciprocity.

I would like to express confidence that the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament will provide an effective impetus to the cessation of the arms race and transition to practical measures for real disarmament. In this way it will justify the hopes which the peoples are pinning on such a representative forum.

I wish the participants in the Session fruitful work for the benefit of the peoples, for the benefit of universal peace.

LEONID BREZHNEV

June 16, 1982

PEACE AND DISARMAMENT INSTRUMENTS SIGNED BY THE USSR IN 1980 AND 1981¹

Introduction

The various instruments of international law signed by the Soviet Union in the first two years of the eighties followed the basic line of consolidating peace, security and international co-operation pursued by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet state.

The Soviet Union's contractual ties on the world scene continued to expand despite the gravely complicated international situation of the late seventies and early eighties. The more aggressive imperialist elements set out to counter the policy of detente, the consolidation of socialism's positions, and the progress of the national liberation movement by an escalation of the arms race, interference in the internal affairs of other states, and by generating international tensions.

In the resulting situation, the USSR and the other countries of the socialist community concentrated their attention on invigorating their unity and on co-ordinated action on the international scene. The meeting of the leaders of the fraternal parties and governments in December 1980 and the sittings of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation's Foreign Ministers Committee (October 1980 and December 1981) showed that the socialist countries are resolved to give top priority in their foreign policy to safeguarding and consolidating peace, and to asserting the right of all nations to freedom and independence.

¹ For instruments of international law on peace and disarmament signed by the Soviet Union between 1978 and the first six months of 1980 see: *Peace and Disarmament. Academic Studies. 1980*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1980, pp. 273-367.

Of importance in this context was the conclusion by the Soviet Union of treaties of friendship and co-operation with the Syrian Arab Republic (October 8, 1980) and the People's Republic of the Congo (May 13, 1981). These treaties rounded out the system of friendship and co-operation treaties signed by the USSR with the Yemen Arab Republic (1965), India (1971), Iraq (1972), Angola (1976), Mozambique (1977), Ethiopia (1978), Afghanistan (1978), and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen (1979).¹ Based on available experience of co-operation with newly-free countries, all these instruments have established a mechanism of international law for the regulation of bilateral relations on a general political plane, and have entrenched the principles of relations between their signatories for the long term.

The preambles to the treaties with Syria and the Congo stress that further development of the friendship and co-operation obtaining between their signatories is consonant with their national interests, and is furthering world peace, the freedom and security of nations, and the principle of respect for sovereignty. They noted the peaceable nature of the foreign policies of the signatories, and the latter's fidelity to the purposes and principles of the UN Charter. They also reflect the distinctive features of relations between socialist states and progressive developing countries, marked by an anti-imperialist orientation and common aims in the fight for peace and international co-operation.

The preamble to the Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation between the USSR and the Syrian Arab Republic says, for example, that its signatories are "determined to give a firm rebuff to the policy of aggression conducted by imperialism and its accomplices, to continue the struggle against colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism, in all their forms and manifestations, including Zionism, to come out for national independence and social progress". In compliance with the above and under Article 3 of the treaty with Syria and Article 5 of the treaty with the Congo, the signatories undertook to continue to co-operate with each other and with other countries in backing the just fight of the peoples for their sovereignty, freedom, independence, and social progress.

¹ For the full text of the treaties see *Vedomosti Verkhovnogo Soveta SSSR*, No. 7, 1965 (YAR), No. 38, 1971 (India), No. 39, 1972, (Iraq); No. 47, 1977 (Angola), No. 50, 1977 (Mozambique), No. 21, 1979 (Ethiopia), No. 26, 1979 (Afghanistan), and No. 12, 1980 (PDRY).

As recorded in articles 1 of the two treaties, closer friendship and co-operation between the respective governments and peoples is attainable only on the general democratic principles of international law, namely, those of equality, respect of sovereignty, territorial integrity, and non-interference in internal affairs. The principles for the strengthening of friendship and co-operation entrenched in the treaties are, indeed, an important highlight in the relations evolving between socialist states and the progressive developing countries. Most important of all, they constitute a dependable contractual basis.

The friendship and co-operation treaties give due support to the non-alignment policy of the developing countries reposing on an anti-imperialist foundation and constituting an important factor in present-day international affairs. Article 3 of the treaty with the Congo and Article 4 of the treaty with Syria state that the non-alignment policy is gaining ever greater significance as a factor of world peace and security, and are evidence of the increasing mutual understanding that prevails between the socialist and non-aligned countries.

Of late, bilateral consultations have become widespread in relations between states. They are a variety of negotiations and constitute an important means of agreeing positions, and of settling possible differences peacefully. Under Article 5 of the treaty with Syria, regular consultations may be held on questions of bilateral relations and on international problems of interest to both sides, notably problems concerning the Middle East. The treaties with Syria and the Congo envisage contacts and consultations, with the procedure of contacts being provided for, under Article 6 of the treaty with Syria and Article 7 of the treaty with the Congo, in the event of situations that imperil peace or in the event of breaches of peace.

The statements of the Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan signed at summit level in 1980, the Joint Soviet-Mozambiquan Statement, the Joint Soviet-Ethiopian Statement, and the Joint Soviet-Indian Declaration are important instruments of international law. All these documents are essentially anti-imperialist in complexion, securing common political positions in consolidating international peace and security.

The Statement of the Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, signed on October 16, 1980, contains important provisions for a political settlement of the situation that has arisen over Afghanistan. The signatories stressed that the way to such a settle-

ment involves effective termination of the outside intervention, and pertinent accords between the governments of Afghanistan and its neighbours, first of all Pakistan.

The Joint Soviet-Ethiopian Statement of November 10, 1980 registered a new stage in the relations of the two countries in all fields on the basis of the Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation and other agreements concluded by the USSR and Socialist Ethiopia.

The Joint Soviet-Indian Declaration signed on December 10, 1980, during the visit to India of Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU and Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, reasserts the firm intention of the signatories "in accordance with the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation between the USSR and India, to continue strengthening and deepening Soviet-Indian friendly and mutually beneficial co-operation in the interests of the peoples of the two countries and the cause of international peace and security".

Being an instrument of international law, the Joint Soviet-Indian Declaration has entrenched important provisions reflecting the common attitude of the two countries towards topical aspects of world affairs. In particular, the Declaration expresses grave concern over the existence of seats of tension in Southeast Asia.

The treaties, statements and declarations signed by the Soviet Union in 1980 and 1981 are important in that they entrench in international law the friendly relations maintained by the Soviet Union with other countries, notably the developing states, in the interests of lasting peace, security, and co-operation among states and peoples.

B. N. Nechayev, Cand. Sc. (Law)

M. A. Lebedev, Cand. Sc. (Law)

TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP AND CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE USSR AND THE SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Syrian Arab Republic,

inspired by the wish to develop and strengthen relations of friendship and all-round co-operation that have formed between them in the interests of the peoples of both states, of the cause of peace and security all over the world, of consolidation of international detente, and development of peaceful co-operation among states,

determined to give a firm rebuff to the policy of aggression conducted by imperialism and its accomplices, to continue the struggle against colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism, in all their forms and manifestations, including Zionism, to come out for national independence and social progress,

attaching great significance to the continuation of co-operation of both countries in establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East,

confirming allegiance to the goals and principles of the Charter of the United Nations Organisation, including the principles of respect for sovereignty, national independence, territorial integrity and non-interference in internal affairs,

decided to conclude the present Treaty and agreed on the following:

Article 1

The High Contracting Parties proclaim their resolve to develop steadily and strengthen friendship and co-operation between

both states and peoples in the political, economic, military, scientific, technological, cultural and other spheres on the basis of the principles of equality, mutual advantage, respect for sovereignty, national independence and territorial integrity, and non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

Article 2

The High Contracting Parties shall promote in every way the strengthening of universal peace and security of peoples, the relaxation of international tensions and its implementation in concrete forms of co-operation among states, the settlement of disputable questions by peaceful means, the removing of any manifestations of the policy of hegemonism and aggression from the practice of international relations.

The Parties shall be co-operating intensively with each other in solving the tasks of ending the arms race, of achieving general and complete disarmament, including nuclear disarmament, under effective international control.

Article 3

The High Contracting Parties guided by their belief in the equality of all peoples and states, regardless of race and religious beliefs, condemn colonialism, racism and Zionism as one of the forms and manifestations of racism, and reaffirm their resolve to wage tireless struggle against them. The Parties will be co-operating with other states in supporting the just aspirations of peoples in their struggle against imperialism for ultimate and complete elimination of colonialism and racial domination, for freedom and social progress.

Article 4

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics shall respect the policy of non-alignment pursued by the Syrian Arab Republic, which constitutes a major factor contributing to the preservation and con-

solidation of international peace and security and to a lessening of international tensions.

The Syrian Arab Republic shall respect the peaceful foreign policy pursued by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, aimed at consolidating friendship and co-operation with all the countries and peoples.

Article 5

The High Contracting Parties shall develop and broaden the practice of mutual exchange of opinions and regular consultations on questions of bilateral relations and international problems of interest to both Parties, and above all on the problems of the Middle East. Consultations and exchanges of opinion shall be held at different levels, above all through meetings of the leading state figures of both Parties.

Article 6

In case a situation emerges, jeopardising the peace or security of one of the Parties or posing a threat to peace or violating peace and security in the whole world, the High Contracting Parties shall enter without delay into contact with each other with a view to co-ordinating their positions and to co-operation in order to remove the threat that has arisen and to restore peace.

Article 7

The High Contracting Parties shall carry out close and comprehensive co-operation in assuring conditions for the preservation and development of the social and economic accomplishments of their peoples, for respecting the sovereignty of each of the two Parties over their natural resources.

Article 8

The High Contracting Parties shall contribute to a steady consolidation and broadening of the mutually advantageous economic as well as scientific-technological co-operation and exchange of experience between them in the field of industry, agriculture, irrigation and water resources, utilisation of oil and other natural resources, in the field of communications, transport and other economic sectors, as well as in the training of national cadres. The Parties undertake to broaden trade and maritime navigation between them on the basis of the principles of equality, mutual benefit and the most-favoured-nation treatment.

Article 9

The High Contracting Parties shall continue to develop their co-operation and exchange of experience in the field of science, art, literature, education, health, information, cinematography, tourism, sports and other fields.

The Parties undertake to contribute to the expansion of contacts and co-operation between the bodies of state power and mass-affiliation organisations, including the trade-union and other public organisations, enterprises, cultural and scientific establishments with a view to an increasingly more profound familiarisation of the peoples of both countries with the life, work, experience and achievements of each other.

Article 10

The High Contracting Parties shall continue to develop co-operation in the military field on the basis of appropriate agreements concluded between them in the interests of strengthening their defence capacity.

Article 11

Each of the High Contracting Parties states that it shall not enter into alliances or participate in any groupings of states as well as in actions or activities directed against the other High Contracting Party.

Article 12

Each of the High Contracting Parties states that its obligations under the current international agreements do not contradict the provisions of this Treaty, and undertakes not to conclude any international agreements which are incompatible with it.

Article 13

Any differences that may arise between the High Contracting Parties in the interpretation or application of any provision of this Treaty shall be resolved on a bilateral basis, in the spirit of friendship, mutual understanding and respect.

Article 14

This Treaty shall be effective for twenty years as of the day it enters into force.

If neither of the High Contracting Parties states six months prior to the expiry of the above-mentioned period its desire to terminate the Treaty, it shall remain effective for the next five years until one of the High Contracting Parties notifies in writing six months prior to the expiry of the current five-year period its intention to terminate it.

Article 15

This Treaty is subject to ratification and shall enter into force on the day of the exchange of the ratification instruments, which shall be done in Damascus.

Done in Moscow on October 8, 1980, in duplicate, each in the Russian and Arabic languages, both texts being equally authentic.

*For the Union of
Soviet Socialist
Republics*

L. BREZHNEV

*For the Syrian Arab
Republic*

/
HAFIZ AL-ASSAD

STATEMENT BY THE SOVIET UNION AND THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF AFGHANISTAN

General Secretary of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan Central Committee, President of the Revolutionary Council and Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan Babrak Karmal is on an official friendly visit in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Soviet Government.

Talks were held, which were conducted, from the Soviet Side, by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet L. I. Brezhnev; Member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the USSR State Security Committee Yu. V. Andropov; Member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs A. A. Gromyko; Member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, First Vice-Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers N. A. Tikhonov; Alternate Member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee B. N. Ponomarev; Member of the CPSU Central Committee, Vice-Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers I. V. Arkhipov; Member of the CPSU Central Committee, Chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces, First Deputy Minister of Defence of the USSR, Marshal of the Soviet Union N. V. Ogarkov; Member of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan F. A. Tabeyev;

from the Afghan Side, by General Secretary of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan Central Committee, President of the Revolutionary Council and Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic

of Afghanistan Babrak Karmal; Member of the Politbureau of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan Central Committee, Vice-President of the Revolutionary Council and Deputy Premier of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan Sultan Ali Keshtmand; Member of the Politbureau, Secretary of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan Central Committee Saleh Mohammad Zeary; Member of the Politbureau of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan Central Committee, Education Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan Anahita Ratebzad; Member of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan Central Committee, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan Shah Mohammad Dost; Member of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan Central Committee, Defence Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan Mohammad Rafi; Member of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan Central Committee, Head of the International Department of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan Central Committee M. Barialay.

The talks and meetings between the Soviet and Afghan leaders were held in an atmosphere of cordiality, comradely sincerity and complete mutual understanding.

The Soviet Side informed the Afghan comrades about the active preparations by the Party and the country for the 26th Congress of the CPSU, about the work to draft the Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1981-1985 and for the Period Ending in 1990, about the political and labour enthusiasm of Soviet people in the closing year of the Tenth Five-Year Plan period. It was stressed that the course for enhancing the effectiveness of production and improving the quality of products will be steadily pursued also in the coming years in the interests of ensuring a rise in the living standards of the Soviet people.

The Afghan comrades spoke about the work being carried out in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan for the implementation of the decisions of the Third Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, which was held in July this year, on measures to intensify the struggle against intervention and counter-revolution, on the course of the implementation of the programme for radical socio-economic transformations aimed at true liberation of the working masses from the oppression of exploiters, at an upswing in national economy, at continuation of the ag-

rarian reform, at ensuring a rise in the living standards of the people of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, at developing national culture, and at democratising public and political life in the country.

The Sides expressed profound satisfaction with the state and development of Soviet-Afghan relations, which are steadily broadening on the basis of the Treaty of Friendship, Good-Neighbourliness and Co-operation of December 5, 1978. In so doing, they pointed out that the second stage of the April Revolution creates most favourable conditions for an all-round development of Soviet-Afghan relations, and the Sides stressed their determination to further strengthen and develop comprehensively relations between the two countries on the basis of fraternal friendship, revolutionary solidarity and the principles of internationalism.

The Sides expressed the desire to further broaden and develop friendly co-operation between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan.

The Afghan Side expressed profound gratitude for the all-round aid and support given by the Soviet people in the struggle waged by the people of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan against counter-revolutionary intervention from the outside, against imperialist interference in the internal affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, for implementing the objectives and tasks of the April Revolution, for building a new society in Afghanistan on the basis of equality and social justice.

It was declared by the Soviet Side that in this struggle the people of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and its government can further count on the Soviet people's solidarity and internationalist assistance.

When discussing the situation, which has developed around Afghanistan as a result of the foreign aggression against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan carried out from the territories of neighbouring states, above all Pakistan, and as a result of the imperialist interference in its internal affairs, with an attempt being made to involve international organisations, full unanimity of the Sides was reaffirmed in ensuring the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Afghanistan and in defending the revolutionary gains of the Afghan people.

Both Sides have come out for a political settlement of the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. This would

have a positive effect on the situation in that part of the world and contribute to improving the international political climate. They have again stressed that the way to such a settlement lies through effectively ending intervention from the outside, through reaching appropriate agreements between the governments of Afghanistan and its neighbours, above all Pakistan, on the basis of the well-known proposals of the government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan of May 14, 1980.

It was stressed specially that no plans affecting the sovereignty of the people of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan or disregarding its legitimate government would be a success. As for the limited Soviet military contingent staying on the territory of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan at the request of the Afghan Government in conformity with the Soviet-Afghan Treaty of 1978 and the UN Charter, the question of the date for withdrawing it can be examined in the context of a political settlement and not before the aggression against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is completely ceased and guarantees are given that subversive activities from abroad against the Afghan people and its government will not be resumed.

The Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan hope that the line towards normalising the situation in the area of the Middle East will meet the constructive support from all forces interested in strengthening peace and international detente.

The Sides highly evaluated the level of Soviet-Afghan technical, economic and trade co-operation and placed on record that this co-operation is assuming a steady and long-term character and is filled with a new content. They spoke for further broadening and perfecting the forms of such co-operation with due regard for the top-priority and long-term objectives in connection with the rehabilitation, upsurge and further development of Afghanistan's national economy.

The Sides pointed out the steady development of Soviet-Afghan relations in the field of culture, education, health protection and sports and expressed their mutual intention to encourage a further strengthening of these ties and with this aim they will promote a broadening of bilateral co-operation and contacts between party, government and public organisations, cultural and research institutions, with a view to using the available opportunities for more deeply familiarising themselves with the life, work, revolutionary experience and achievements of the peoples of the two countries.

The Sides examined the key issues of the present-day international situation and pointed out that the main cause of its aggravation is the striving of the imperialist circles to halt progressive historical changes, to change in their own favour the balance of forces, which has taken shape in the world, to achieve military supremacy, to foist a new round of the arms race, undermine detente and provoke a relapse of the cold war.

The Sides stressed that none of the problems of concern for mankind can be resolved from the positions of strength and the policy of diktat. They are profoundly convinced that there is no more urgent task than preserving and strengthening the process of detente and that no country and no government can stand aside from the struggle for peace, international security and for real disarmament.

In this connection the Sides noted with satisfaction the understanding reached between the USSR and the USA that their representatives start a practical discussion of issues pertaining to the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe.

Both Sides are in favour of enhancing the effectiveness of the United Nations Organisation in maintaining international peace and security on the basis of a strict and steadfast implementation of the provisions of the UN Charter.

The Afghan Side stressed the exceptional significance of the proposals submitted by the Soviet Union for consideration by the 35th Session of the UN General Assembly, which are aimed at lessening the danger of war, strengthening universal peace and curbing the arms race. It also stressed its full support for the peace initiatives put forward last May by the Meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Member-States, including the proposal on holding a summit meeting of the leaders of the states of all areas of the world to discuss problems connected with the elimination of seats of international tension and prevention of war.

Both Sides also consider it important that the forthcoming Madrid meeting of representatives of the states—participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe—be held in a constructive spirit, and that the main attention at it be devoted to co-ordinating practical steps for the implementation of all the provisions of the Final Act. In this context, of great significance would be reaching an understanding as regards the holding of a conference on military detente and disarmament in Europe.

The Sides devoted special attention to the situation in Asia, which recently aggravated as a result of co-ordinated actions by the imperialist and hegemonistic forces.

Upholding the cause of peace all over the world and urging that war as a means of settling disputes between states be eliminated, the Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan declare for an end to hostilities between Iraq and Iran and a settlement of disputable issues between them through negotiations, without outside interference, on a mutually acceptable basis. Withdrawal of the warships of the USA and some other NATO member-countries from the Persian Gulf zone would create a favourable atmosphere for the attainment of such a settlement and normalisation of the situation in that area.

The Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan are declaring their full support for the struggle of the Arab peoples for establishing a lasting and just peace in the Middle East through a comprehensive settlement, including the ensurance of the right of the Arab people of Palestine to create their own state.

The Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan invariably and consistently come out for normalising the situation in Asia and firmly establishing there good-neighbourly relations, for ensuring lasting peace and security by joint efforts of the states of that continent themselves.

The USSR and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan declare their solidarity with the peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea, which are upholding their sovereignty and independence. They highly evaluate the constructive proposals formulated at the meeting of Foreign Ministers of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea last July, which are a good basis for normalising relations between the countries of Indochina and the ASEAN member-states as well as for creating a healthier atmosphere in that area as a whole. The Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan fully support the efforts of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea for the development of relations of good-neighbourliness and co-operation with the ASEAN member-countries, for turning Southeast Asia into a zone of peace and stability.

Both Sides positively evaluate the significance of India's peace-loving policy for the cause of peace and security in Asia.

The USSR and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan support

the striving of the littoral states of the Indian Ocean to turn that ocean into a zone of peace, where all foreign military bases would be dismantled, and nobody would threaten the security, independence and sovereignty of the littoral states. Declaring their support of the UN decision to hold in 1981 an international conference on the question of turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace, the Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan are ready, together with other countries, to contribute to the success of that conference.

It was declared by the Afghan Side that being one of the founding states of the non-aligned movement, which is an important factor of maintaining peace and security, Afghanistan intends to continue taking a vigorous part in the activity of this movement, adhering to its fundamental anti-imperialist principles. It was reaffirmed by the Soviet Side that the Soviet Union respects the non-aligned policy pursued by the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan as is envisaged also by the Soviet -Afghan Treaty of Friendship, Good-Neighbourliness and Co-operation of December 5, 1978.

The USSR and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan are expressing confidence that the non-aligned states will make an increasingly weightier positive contribution to the common struggle of the peoples for peace, detente and disarmament, against the aggressive policy of imperialism, for the freedom and independence of peoples, for strengthening political and economic independence of the newly-free countries.

Both Sides have expressed profound satisfaction with the results of the visit of General Secretary of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan Central Committee, President of the Revolutionary Council and Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan Babrak Karmal to the Soviet Union, stressed full identity of views on all issues discussed and pointed out that the talks held and the agreements reached during the visit are an important stage in strengthening fraternal friendship between the Soviet and Afghan peoples, in strengthening and further deepening Soviet-Afghan relations and all-round co-operation.

Babrak Karmal extended an invitation to the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Leonid Brezhnev and Member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the USSR Council

of Ministers Alexei Kosygin to visit the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan at a time convenient to them. The invitations were accepted with gratitude.

*For the Union of
Soviet Socialist
Republics*

*For the Democratic
Republic
of Afghanistan*

LEONID BREZHNEV

BABRAK KARMAL

Moscow, October 16, 1980

COMMUNIQUE OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE OF FOREIGN MINISTERS OF WARSAW TREATY MEMBER-STATES

The Committee of Foreign Ministers of the Countries of the Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance held a regular meeting in Warsaw on October 19-20, 1980.

Taking part in it were: P. Mladenov, Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of Bulgaria; F. Puja, Foreign Minister of the Hungarian People's Republic; O. Fischer, Foreign Minister of the German Democratic Republic; J. Czyrek, Foreign Minister of the Polish People's Republic; S. Andrei, Foreign Minister of the Socialist Republic of Romania; A. A. Gromyko, Foreign Minister of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and B. Chnoupek, Foreign Minister of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

In keeping with the instruction of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member-countries, the Committee of Foreign Ministers examined questions connected with preparations for the Madrid meeting of representatives of the states that participated in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and with the convocation of a conference on military detente and disarmament in Europe.

1. During the exchange of opinions held in this connection it was pointed out unanimously that the development of events in Europe and in the world in the recent period confirms the substantiated nature and correctness of the appraisals of the current international situation given in the Warsaw Declaration of the Political Consultative Committee of May 15, 1980, and makes still more topical the proposals contained in the Declaration on the concrete steps to lessen international tensions, to continue and deepen the policy of detente, to consolidate

security and co-operation in Europe and in the whole world, to check the arms race and to achieve disarmament, to ensure respect for the independence of the peoples and to improve relations between states.

On behalf of their states, the Ministers expressed concern over the continued international tensions resulting from the further activation of the imperialist power politics, confrontation and hegemonism, violation of independence and sovereignty of states, interference in their internal affairs, the absence of progress in settling international problems, and from the emergence of new conflicts. They stressed the danger inherent in the new spiral of the arms race in Europe and throughout the world, in the desire for military superiority and the emergence of military-political doctrines and concepts jeopardising peace.

At the same time the Ministers pointed out that an increasing number of states, broad circles of the public, the democratic forces, the peoples of the world are becoming resolutely opposed to the international tensions and are favouring detente, peace and respect for the right of the peoples to decide their destinies themselves. As a result, it has been possible to prevent the destruction of the traditional normal political contacts and ties between states. In practically all European countries the awareness is gaining strength that the policy of detente has no reasonable, acceptable alternative, and interest is growing in continuing this policy and in developing the process begun by the European Conference.

2. The participants in the meeting reaffirmed that the states represented by them are resolved to work for ending the arms race, extending detente to all the areas of the world, pursuing a policy of respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of all states, non-use of force or the threat of force, non-interference in internal affairs, strict observance of all the principles of relations between states, contained in the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. They favour an intensification of contacts and dialogue to this end with all states of Europe and the world. They are convinced that the Helsinki Final Act provides a reliable foundation for joint efforts by states and peoples to overcome the difficulties that have arisen in the international relations, to make a further headway along the path of consolidating security and expanding co-operation in Europe.

In all of their activities, the states represented at the meeting proceed from the fact that it is necessary to consistently work for settl-

ing all the international questions by peaceful political means, through negotiations, on the basis of equality and respect for the legitimate interests of each people. They are also of the view that there are no types of armaments whose limitation and reduction could not be agreed upon on the basis of reciprocity and with the strict observance of the principle of equality and equal security, as well as that of undiminished security of each state.

3. The participants in the meeting consider that in the current complex international situation the importance of the meeting of representatives of the states—parties to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, due to begin on November 11 of this year, in Madrid, is further enhanced. They wish to see that the opportunities opening up in connection with the Madrid meeting were used to reaffirm the course of detente as the main direction for shaping up the situation in Europe. They also wish that the meeting should elaborate agreements on further practical steps in all the basic directions of consolidating security and co-operation on the European continent.

In this connection the states represented at the meeting believe that the success of the Madrid meeting will depend on the political will of all its participants to create at the meeting a constructive atmosphere, a climate of co-operation and of the desire to achieve generally acceptable agreements, on their determination not to undertake any actions capable of leading to a situation of political confrontation.

For their part, the states represented at the meeting will be prepared to make, at the Madrid meeting, their contribution both to assuring its being held in a positive political atmosphere and to elaborating practical agreements on the substance of the issues to be discussed.

4. Proceeding from the fact that a lessening of the military tensions in the present-day conditions is decisive for progress in inter-state relations towards peace and detente, the participants in the meeting consider that the necessary attention must be given in Madrid to examining the military aspects of European security and concrete steps that can be taken in this field in keeping with the provisions of the Final Act. Of special importance in this context would be the adoption by the Madrid meeting of a decision on convening a conference on military detente and disarmament in Europe as an important component of the development of the all-European process begun by the Helsinki Conference, on the procedure, the date and the venue for the holding of that conference.

The participants in the meeting noted that the idea of convening such a conference enjoys an ever broadening support. Although differences still remain in the views of the states as regards some of the aspects of the question of its convening and its tasks, still there are quite a few points that may bring the positions closer together.

The states represented at the meeting reaffirm that they favour a stage-by-stage holding of the conference, a continuity between its successive stages. At its first stage, the conference should concentrate on broadening the confidence-building measures, on the understanding that subsequently it will be able to get down to co-ordinating measures pertaining to lowering the level and the density of the military confrontation in Europe, including a limitation of military activity and a reduction of the armed forces and armaments. There transpire certain similar features in the approaches of many other countries to the contents of the conference proceedings.

Bearing in mind the views expressed by various countries with regard to the substance of the proceedings of the conference on military detente and disarmament in Europe, the participants in the meeting believe that agreement on convening such a conference should give all the participants equal rights and possibilities to make practical proposals. It is important that this approach be reflected in the resolution of the Madrid meeting regarding the convening of the conference. The concrete proposals of the Warsaw Treaty member-states for consideration by that conference are well known. They are also prepared to examine at the conference the relevant proposals of other states.

The Ministers reaffirmed their countries' support for the proposal that the conference on military detente and disarmament in Europe be held in Warsaw.

5. The participants in the meeting reaffirmed the intention of their states to make their contribution to the achievement at the Madrid meeting of agreements within the framework of all the sections of the Final Act.

They also spoke in favour of the adoption by the Madrid meeting of effective measures for intensifying co-operation in the field of economy, science, engineering and the environment. They attach major importance to intensifying co-operation in the field of energy, and to convening an all-European conference on this major issue. They favour the development of a broad and unobstructed trade exchange, industrial co-operation, co-operation in the field of agriculture, transport and research.

The participants in the meeting deem it desirable and possible to make headway at the Madrid meeting in the implementation of the Helsinki accords in the field of culture, education, information and contacts—on the principled basis defined by the Final Act which constitutes one single whole.

The states represented at the meeting also attach major importance to implementing the provisions of the Final Act as regards continuing the all-European process begun in Helsinki, with a view to consistent progress along the path of strengthening detente, consolidating security and developing equal co-operation between all the states—participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Meetings of representatives of these states and other forms of contacts between them, provided for by the Final Act, are called upon to play a positive role in implementing these objectives. The participants in the meeting noted in this connection that the achievement, at the Madrid meeting, of real progress in strengthening detente, consolidating security and developing co-operation on the European continent is of special importance for the continuation of the process begun by the European Conference.

With account for this, the states represented at the meeting will be prepared to define at the Madrid meeting the respective conditions for holding another meeting of this kind. In this context, the Ministers pointed out that their countries will be prepared to support the proposal of the Socialist Republic of Romania that this meeting be held in the city of Bucharest.

6. The member-states of the Warsaw Treaty, guided by the interests of eliminating the threat of nuclear war, as well as by the concern for ensuring a peaceful life for the European peoples, support the proposal of the Soviet Union on negotiations regarding the medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, simultaneously and in organic link with the US forward-based nuclear means. The participants in the meeting noted with satisfaction that between the Soviet Union and the United States of America there have begun practical discussions of these questions, and expressed the hope for their success which would constitute a step towards eliminating the threat of nuclear war on the European continent.

7. The participants in the meeting stressed that the socialist states—participants in the Vienna talks on mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe—had taken, in their proposals of

July 10, 1980 major new steps to meet the position of the Western countries. In these conditions, to achieve a change at the Vienna talks in the direction of achieving mutually acceptable agreements it is necessary that the Western countries participating in these negotiations also display the political will to resolve the questions under discussion.

8. The participants in the meeting likewise stressed the importance of other concrete proposals on limiting the arms race, consolidating peace and strengthening international security, contained in the Warsaw Declaration of the Political Consultative Committee of May 15, 1980. All these proposals are still valid, and the member-states of the Warsaw Treaty are prepared to begin serious, businesslike negotiations on each of them with other states concerned. /

The meeting of the Committee of Foreign Ministers was held in an atmosphere of fraternal friendship and close comradely co-operation.

JOINT SOVIET-ETHIOPIAN STATEMENT

At the invitation of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Soviet Government, Chairman of the Provisional Military Administrative Council (PMAC) and of the Commission for Organising the Party of the Working People of Ethiopia (COPWE) and Commander-in-Chief of the Revolutionary Army of Socialist Ethiopia, Mengistu Haile Mariam paid an official friendly visit to the Soviet Union from October 27 to November 10, 1980.

The Soviet and Ethiopian leaders held talks on bilateral relations and co-operation, as well as on major international issues of mutual interest. The talks were conducted in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding.

Participating in the talks were:

on the Soviet Side—Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet; Nikolai Tikhonov, Member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR; Andrei Gromyko, Member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR; Boris Ponomarev, Alternate Member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Nikolai Ogarkov, Member of the CPSU Central Committee, Chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces, First Deputy Minister of Defence of the USSR, Marshal of the Soviet Union;

on the Ethiopian Side—Mengistu Haile Mariam, Chairman of the Provisional Military Administrative Council, and of the Commission for Organising the Party of the Working People of Ethiopia and Com-

mander-in-Chief of the Revolutionary Army of Socialist Ethiopia; Brig. General Tesfaye Gebre Kidan, Member of the PMAC Standing Committee and COPWE Executive Committee, Minister of National Defence; Berhanu Bayih, Member of the PMAC Standing Committee and COPWE Executive Committee, Head of the COPWE Foreign Affairs Department; Addis Tedla, Member of the PMAC Standing Committee and COPWE Executive Committee, Deputy Chairman of the Supreme Council of the National Revolutionary Development Campaign and Central Planning.

Taking part in the talks were:

on the Soviet Side—Anatoly Blatov, Assistant to the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Leonid Ilyichov, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR; Boris Kirnasovsky, Ambassador of the USSR to Socialist Ethiopia; Vyacheslav Ustinov, Head of the Third African Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs;

on the Ethiopian Side—Teferra Wolde-Semayat, Minister of Finance; Dr. Feleke Gedle-Giorgis, Minister of Foreign Affairs; Tesfaye Dinka, Minister of Industry; Kassa Gebre, Minister of Urban Development and Housing; Goshu Wolde, Minister of Education; Geremew Debele, Minister of Agriculture; Mengistu Gemechu, special aide to the PMAC Chairman; Colonel Gebreyes Wolde-Hanna, Head of the Main Political Department of the Revolutionary Army; Fassika Sidelil, First Deputy Head of COPWE's Ideological Department; Nesibu Taye, Ambassador of Socialist Ethiopia to the USSR, Shewandagn Belete, Second Deputy Head of COPWE's Organisational Department.

Leonid Brezhnev presented Mengistu Haile Mariam with the Order of the October Revolution. Mengistu Haile Mariam presented Leonid Brezhnev with the Order of the Star of Honour of Socialist Ethiopia.

The high guest laid wreaths to the Lenin Mausoleum and to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, attended the military parade and the manifestation of working people in Moscow on the occasion of the 63rd anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

During their stay in the Soviet Union Mengistu Haile Mariam and his party visited Moscow, Volgograd and Alma-Ata where they familiarised themselves with the achievements and life of the working people, took part in Soviet-Ethiopian mass meetings of friendship, visited several industrial and agricultural enterprises, as well as scientific and cultural institutions.

I

Having reviewed the relations between the Soviet Union and Socialist Ethiopia, the two Sides emphasised that these relations are deepening and expanding in all fields on the basis of the Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation, and the relevant Soviet-Ethiopian agreements, that they reflect the common interests and the adherence of the peoples of the two countries to the ideals of the struggle against imperialism, expansionism, colonialism, racism, apartheid and reaction and contribute to the unity of all progressive, democratic and peace-loving forces in their struggle for peace and international security, freedom, independence and social progress.

The two Sides reviewed the progress in the implementation of the Soviet-Ethiopian agreements on co-operation in the economic, scientific, technical, trade, cultural and other fields. They noted that the co-operation is developing successfully and agreed on its further expansion.

In this context, the two Sides have signed the following protocols: Protocol to the Agreement on Economic and Technical Co-operation of September 19, 1978, Regarding the Development of the Gambella Valley; Protocol on Economic and Technical Co-operation in Construction of the Cement Plant; Protocol of the Second Session of the Inter-Governmental Soviet-Ethiopian Commission for Economic, Scientific and Technical Co-operation and Trade.

The Soviet Union expresses solidarity with the Ethiopian revolution, supports the Ethiopian people's efforts to restructure the society along the socialist lines. The Soviet Union hails the establishment of the Commission for Organising the Party of the Working People of Ethiopia, and also the resolutions of the First Congress of the Commission. The Congress of the COPWE marks a significant step in furthering the country's political, social and economic transformations. The Soviet people rejoice at the achievements of the friendly people of Socialist Ethiopia under the leadership of the Provisional Military Administrative Council.

The Soviet Union notes with satisfaction the active role Socialist Ethiopia plays in the international arena, gives a high appraisal of its contribution to the struggle of peoples against imperialism, colonialism, racism and apartheid, to the cause of strengthening peace, non-alignment, detente, disarmament and equitable international co-operation.

Socialist Ethiopia hails the successes of the Soviet people in the eco-

conomic, technological and cultural fields attained under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in building the society of developed socialism and in laying down the material and technical foundation of communism.

The Ethiopian Side expresses appreciation for the Soviet Union's contribution to furthering the causes of detente, disarmament, peace and co-operation, as well as for its internationalist support for peoples struggling against colonialism, neo-colonialism and expansionism. The people of Ethiopia express profound gratitude to the Central Committee of the CPSU, the government and people of the Soviet Union for the consistent and all-round support of their struggle against aggression and of their endeavours in the field of economic and social reconstruction and development.

The Soviet Union and Socialist Ethiopia attach great importance to the further development of mutual contacts and exchanges of views and experience, widening co-operation in the political, economic, technological, cultural and other fields.

Both Sides are convinced that favourable conditions are created for the development of fruitful ties between the CPSU and the COPWE.

II

Having reviewed the prevailing international situation, the Soviet Union and Socialist Ethiopia note that the international atmosphere has of late been aggravated as a result of the policy pursued by imperialists, primarily by the ruling circles of the USA, which continue to stir up tension, fan war hysteria and step up the arms race, above all the nuclear arms race, in an attempt to change the existing military balance in their favour.

The Soviet Union and Socialist Ethiopia condemn such a course which enhances the military danger and call upon all peace-loving states to unite their efforts with a view to preventing the deterioration of the situation, continuing and developing the policy of detente and peaceful co-operation, counteracting the moves of the imperialist forces and their accomplices which lead to the aggravation of international tension.

The Ethiopian Side noted the great significance of the recent proposals submitted by the Soviet Union for consideration by the UN Ge-

neral Assembly which envisage a set of measures for strengthening peace and improving the international atmosphere.

Both Sides favour the holding of a top-level meeting of leaders of states of all regions of the world to discuss problems related to the elimination of hotbeds of international tension and the prevention of the danger of war.

The Soviet Union and Socialist Ethiopia stand for the adoption of measures aimed at achieving agreements at the negotiations on different aspects of limiting the arms race and disarmament and at resuming negotiations in those spheres where they have been suspended or broken off.

III

Having reviewed in detail the situation in Africa, the Soviet Union and Socialist Ethiopia express satisfaction at the significant progress achieved by African states and peoples in their struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and apartheid. In this connection the two Sides noted with appreciation the efforts of African states in strengthening their national sovereignty, raising the level of social, economic and cultural development, as well as enhancing inter-state co-operation.

They call upon all states to actively support African countries in their struggle against colonialism, neo-colonialism, apartheid and racism and to provide the necessary economic, financial and technical assistance in their efforts to raise the living standard of their peoples.

The Soviet Union and Socialist Ethiopia express serious concern over the attempts of imperialist and reactionary forces to aggravate the situation in Africa and undermine the effectiveness of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU). They condemn any interference, direct or indirect, of these forces in the internal affairs of independent African countries.

The two Sides reviewed the situation in the Horn of Africa and noted that the installation of military bases by the US Administration in Somalia poses a direct and serious threat to Ethiopia, as well as to the peace and security in the region. They condemn the installation of such bases in the region and call for their speedy removal.

The Soviet Union and Socialist Ethiopia consistently stand for creating an atmosphere of mutual understanding and good-neighbourliness

in the Horn of Africa on the basis of mutual respect by all states of the region for the sovereignty, territorial integrity, inviolability of state frontiers and non-interference in the domestic affairs of each other and renunciation of territorial claims. The Soviet Union hails the positive results achieved by Socialist Ethiopia in its policy to promote good-neighbourliness and mutually advantageous co-operation with neighbouring countries.

Having examined the prevailing situation in Southern Africa, both Sides expressed their satisfaction with the victory scored by the people of Zimbabwe and pledged their unswerving support to the government and people of Zimbabwe in their struggle for national reconstruction. Both Sides expressed their conviction that the independence of Zimbabwe would provide an additional impetus for the liberation struggle of the peoples of Namibia and South Africa.

The Soviet Union and Socialist Ethiopia condemn the racist Pretoria regime for its continued aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and other independent African states and call upon all states to render necessary assistance and support in their efforts to stand against such repeated acts of aggression.

The Soviet Union and Socialist Ethiopia reaffirm their full support for the national liberation movements in Southern Africa. They stand for the termination of the illegal occupation of Namibia and the withdrawal from its territory of the troops of the racist South African regime, for the full implementation of the UN resolutions on Namibia and the attainment of genuine independence by the country under the leadership of SWAPO—the sole legitimate and genuine representative of the Namibian people.

Both Sides declare their solidarity with the people of South Africa struggling for the elimination of the ignominious fascist system of apartheid and call upon all states to strictly implement the UN resolutions on sanctions against South Africa. They condemn the continuing collaboration between Western powers and Pretoria, especially in the nuclear field, which poses a serious threat to the security of independent African states and world peace.

The two Sides call for a resolute stand against the manoeuvres of imperialist and reactionary forces in Africa. They are convinced that the process of the relaxation of international tension should spread to all areas of the world, including the African continent. Reaffirming their adherence to the idea of establishing nuclear-free zones in vari-

ous areas of the world, the two Sides declare their resolve to work for turning the African continent into a nuclear-free zone.

The Soviet Union and Socialist Ethiopia view positively the role of the Organisation of African Unity, its contribution to the struggle of the peoples of Africa against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and apartheid. They highly commend the OAU efforts to settle existing problems peacefully, to strengthen inter-state relations and co-operation in Africa and to create and maintain a healthy political climate in the continent.

The Soviet Union and Socialist Ethiopia note with great concern the feverish military activities of imperialist circles and the establishment and expansion of US military bases in the Red Sea, the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf area. Such activities and the deployment of the US "rapid deployment force" pose a direct threat to the security of the countries of the region and constitute a grave danger to world peace.

The two Sides condemn the dangerous actions of imperialist states in concentrating their military forces in the Indian Ocean and, particularly, in the Persian Gulf area, the expansion of existing military bases and creation of new ones, the attempts to form new military and political blocs. They reaffirmed their support for the idea of making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace.

The Soviet Union and Socialist Ethiopia stand for making the Red Sea a zone of peace on the basis of strict respect for the rights and interests of all littoral states and non-interference in their internal affairs, with due regard for the interests of international navigation.

IV

The Soviet Union and Socialist Ethiopia express their serious concern over the dangerous development of the situation in the Middle East. They condemn the policy of separate deals which is directed against the legitimate interests of the Arab peoples and which raises serious obstacles in the way of achieving a just and comprehensive settlement in the Middle East.

The two Sides reaffirm their strong support for the Arab states and peoples which reject the anti-Arab Camp David collusion. They renew their appeal for achieving a just and lasting peace in the Middle East on the basis of a complete withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab

territories occupied in 1967, the exercise of the legitimate national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to self-determination and establishment of their own independent state, as well as ensuring the right of all states of the region to independent and secure existence and development.

The Soviet Union and Socialist Ethiopia express their deep concern over the armed conflict between Iraq and Iran which is detrimental to the interests of their peoples, to the cause of peace and security in the region, as well as to the international situation as a whole. The two Sides stand for a speedy settlement of the conflict by peaceful means through negotiations first of all between the countries in conflict. The two Sides support the efforts of the United Nations and the non-aligned movement for a political solution to the conflict.

The two Sides declare their solidarity with and total support for the government and the heroic people of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan in their struggle for national independence and sovereignty, for defending the gains of the April Revolution. They condemn the overt and covert interference by imperialists and reactionary forces in the internal affairs of that country. The two Sides declare their full support for the constructive proposals made by the government of Afghanistan on May 14, 1980.

The Soviet Union and Socialist Ethiopia express their solidarity with the peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea who seek to ensure peace and stability in Southeast Asia, to develop relations of good-neighbourliness and fruitful co-operation among all states of the region. They reaffirm their support for the People's Revolutionary Council of the People's Republic of Kampuchea which is the sole legitimate representative of Kampuchea entitled to speak on its behalf in the United Nations and all other international forums.

The Soviet Union and Socialist Ethiopia stand against the great-power hegemonistic course pursued by the Chinese leadership colluding with imperialism and reaction, which is hostile to the cause of peace and socialism. They condemn its aggression against Vietnam and its interference in the internal affairs of Kampuchea.

Noting the great importance of the United Nations in international affairs, the Soviet Union and Socialist Ethiopia express their common opinion about the need for further strengthening this international organisation and enhancing its effectiveness in maintaining international peace and security on the basis of strict observance of its Charter by

all countries. They reiterate their resolve to co-operate in the UN with a view to curbing the arms race and achieving disarmament, promoting the relaxation of international tension and developing all-round co-operation between states with different social systems.

* * *

Having expressed their satisfaction with the results of the official friendly visit to the Soviet Union by Mengistu Haile Mariam, both Sides note that their talks make a new important contribution to the further development of friendship and all-round co-operation between the Soviet Union and Socialist Ethiopia.

Mengistu Haile Mariam expressed the heartfelt gratitude to the Soviet leaders and the people of the Soviet Union for the fraternal welcome and cordial hospitality accorded to him and his party.

The Chairman of the Provisional Military Administrative Council and the Commission for Organising the Party of the Working People of Ethiopia, Commander-in-Chief of the Revolutionary Army of Socialist Ethiopia Mengistu Haile Mariam extended an invitation to General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet L. I. Brezhnev to pay an official friendly visit to Ethiopia.

The invitation was accepted with gratitude. The date of the visit shall be fixed through diplomatic channels.

L. BREZHNEV,
General Secretary
of the Central
Committee of the
CPSU, Chairman
of the Presidium
of the Supreme
Soviet of the USSR

Moscow, November 10, 1980

MENGISTU HAILE
MARIAM,
Chairman of the
Provisional Military
Administrative
Council and the
Commission of the
Organising the Party
of the Working
People of Ethiopia,
Commander-in-Chief
of the Revolutionary
Army of Socialist
Ethiopia

JOINT SOVIET-MOZAMBICAN STATEMENT

Chairman of the FRELIMO Party, President of the People's Republic of Mozambique Samora Moises Machel stayed in the Soviet Union on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Soviet Government from 17 to 22 November, 1980, at the head of a party and state delegation.

During the visit, talks between General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet L. I. Brezhnev; Member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs A. A. Gromyko; CPSU Central Committee Secretary M. V. Zimyanin; Member of the CPSU Central Committee, First Vice-Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR I. V. Arkhipov; Member of the CPSU Central Committee, Chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces, First Deputy Minister of Defence of the USSR, Marshal of the Soviet Union N. V. Ogarkov—on the Soviet Side, and Chairman of the FRELIMO Party, President of the People's Republic of Mozambique S. Machel; Member of the Permanent Political Committee of the Central Committee of the FRELIMO Party, FRELIMO Central Committee Secretary for International Relations, Member of the Permanent Commission of the People's Assembly, Minister of Foreign Affairs Joaquim Alberto Chissano; Member of the Permanent Political Committee of the Central Committee of the FRELIMO Party, Deputy of the People's Assembly, Minister of Planning and Agriculture Mario da Graça Machungo; Member of the Central Committee of the FRELIMO Party, Member of the Permanent Commission of the People's Assembly, Commander

of the Air Force Joao Americo Mpfumo; Member of the Central Committee of the FRELIMO Party, Chief of the Department of Defence and Security of the Central Committee, Deputy of the People's Assembly, Director of the Bank of Mozambique in the rank of Minister Sergio Vieira; Deputy of the People's Assembly, Minister of Industry and Energy Antonio Rodrigues Branco—on the Side of the People's Republic of Mozambique, were held in an atmosphere of friendship and complete mutual understanding, revealing a coincidence of views on the questions of bilateral relations and the current international situation, which were discussed.

The talks were attended:

on the Soviet Side—by Chief of the Department of International Information of the CPSU Central Committee L. M. Zamyatin, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR N. P. Firyubin, Referent of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Ye. M. Samoteikin, Ambassador of the USSR to the People's Republic of Mozambique V. P. Vdovin, Heads of Departments in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Yu. N. Chernyakov and V. A. Ustinov;

on the Mozambican Side—by Member of the Central Committee of the FRELIMO Party, Deputy of the People's Assembly, Deputy Commander of the Army Tobias Dai; Head of the Personnel Department of the Central Committee of the FRELIMO Party, Chief of the Office of the Chairman of the FRELIMO Party, Deputy of the People's Assembly Jose Julio Andrade; Deputy of the People's Assembly, Secretary of State for Coal and Hydrocarbons Abdul Magid Osman; Deputy of the People's Assembly, General Secretary of the Organisation of Mozambican Youth Zacarias Kupela; Secretary of State for Cotton Cultivation João dos Santos Ferreira; Secretary of State for Fisheries Joaquim Tenreiro de Almeida; Ambassador of the People's Republic of Mozambique to the Soviet Union Hipolito Zozimo Particio.

L. I. Brezhnev presented Samora Moises Machel with the Order of Friendship Among the Peoples.

The high guest laid wreaths to the Lenin Mausoleum and to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

During his stay in the Soviet Union, Samora Moises Machel and the officials accompanying him have, besides Moscow, visited Frunze and Tashkent, where they familiarised themselves with the life and achievements of the Soviet people, took part in a meeting of Soviet-

Mozambican friendship, visited a number of industrial and agricultural enterprises, as well as cultural institutions.

During the talks, both Sides noted with satisfaction that the Soviet-Mozambican relations based on the Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation of March 31, 1977, between the USSR and the People's Republic of Mozambique are steadily being consolidated and developed in the interests of the peoples of both countries, as well as in the interests of the cause of peace and socialism.

Highly appraising the level of the Soviet-Mozambican relations, the Sides stated their resolve to continue to follow further the path of deepening co-operation in the political, economic, cultural and other fields. In this connection, the Sides welcomed the establishment of a Soviet-Mozambican Inter-Governmental Commission on Economic and Technical Co-operation and Trade, which will provide a new impetus to the development of friendly relations between the two countries. They decided to continue to develop further their mutual contacts and to conduct regular consultations on questions of bilateral relations and international problems.

During the exchange of opinions on questions of co-operation between the CPSU and the FRELIMO, it was reaffirmed that the development of the fraternal ties between the two Parties, based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, is of important significance for the whole complex of Soviet-Mozambican relations and for the world revolutionary movement.

Proceeding from the interests of consolidating friendship between the two countries and strengthening the cause of socialism, the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Mozambique have agreed to continue co-operation on a mutually advantageous basis in the development of a number of key sectors of the Mozambican economy, including the development of mineral deposits, agriculture and fishing.

Agreement was reached to the effect that the Soviet Union will broaden its assistance to the People's Republic of Mozambique in training skilled national personnel, especially at the level of vocational training, both in the Soviet Union and in Mozambique.

Signed during the visit were: the Agreement on Co-operation Between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the FRELIMO Party, the Agreement Between the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the People's Republic

of Mozambique on the Establishment of a Soviet-Mozambican Inter-Governmental Commission on Economic and Technical Co-operation and Trade, and the Protocol on Cultural and Scientific Co-operation Between the USSR and the People's Republic of Mozambique for 1981-1982.

The Soviet Side gave a high appraisal to the measures now being taken by the People's Republic of Mozambique with a view to protecting the revolutionary gains of the Mozambican people, to implementing profound political and socio-economic changes in the country and building a socialist society. It welcomed the big contribution which the People's Republic of Mozambique is making to the cause of the national liberation of peoples, to the cause of peace, of the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, racism and Zionism.

The Mozambican Side welcomed the big successes scored by the Soviet people under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in building a developed socialist society and creating the material and technical basis of communism. It stressed the big role which the country of Lenin is playing in the preservation of international peace, in the struggle for an end to the arms race, for detente and disarmament, for the victory of today's revolutionary forces. Also stressed was the importance of the assistance given by the Soviet Union to the struggle of the oppressed peoples for their liberation. The Mozambican Side has given a high appraisal to the consistent solidarity of the Soviet Union with the struggle of the Mozambican people for the consolidation of its sovereignty in the face of threats and acts of aggression on the part of imperialists and racists, for the construction of socialism and elimination of backwardness.

The Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Mozambique took note with satisfaction of the successes in the struggle of the peoples against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism, including Zionism, for national independence, democracy, peace and progress. They noted an ever growing cohesion between the socialist countries, the communist and workers' parties of the capitalist countries and the national liberation movement of the peoples, which constitutes a prerequisite for the successes of the modern revolutionary movement. The two Sides welcome the growing positive role of the movement of non-aligned countries in the anti-imperialist struggle for national independence, for peace and economic and social development of the peoples.

Both Sides, reiterating their commitment to and respect for the principles and objectives of the United Nations Organisation, advocate a strengthening of the role of that organisation in the consolidation of peace and international security on the basis of strict compliance with its Charter.

They point out a deepening of the anti-imperialist content of the national liberation struggle on the African continent. The growing number of the African countries which have set themselves the aim of restructuring their societies on socialist principles constitutes a prerequisite for a further development of the successful anti-imperialist struggle in Africa.

The Sides welcomed the new victories of the anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist forces in Africa, and expressed confidence that in the near future all the countries of the African continent will gain full independence. They expressed their satisfaction over the gaining of independence by Zimbabwe as a result of the heroic armed struggle of its people for national liberation from the colonial and racist regime and declared their consistent support for the freely and democratically elected government of Zimbabwe and its people. The Sides expressed the confidence that the people of Zimbabwe will be able to maintain its unity, to consolidate its national independence and to build its own state on the basis of peace and social progress.

The Soviet Side highly appreciated the internationalist assistance given by the People's Republic of Mozambique to the struggle of the people of Zimbabwe for its national independence, as well as the joint solidarity of the frontline states.

The Mozambican Side noted the assistance which the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have given to the cause of Zimbabwe's liberation.

The Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Mozambique reassert their complete solidarity with the struggle of the people of Namibia for freedom and independence, call for an immediate end to the occupation of that country and withdrawal from its territory of the South African troops, complete implementation without delay of the resolutions of the United Nations Organisation on Namibia and a transfer of the power in the country to SWAPO—the sole and genuine representative of the Namibian people.

The Sides support the struggle of the people of South Africa under the leadership of the ANC for the liquidation of the shameful system

of apartheid and demand an end to the aggressive actions of the Republic of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola and the Republic of Zambia. It was stressed that the continuing collaboration of the Western powers with Pretoria, including in the field of nuclear weapons, poses a serious threat to the cause of peace.

The Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Mozambique express serious concern over the policy of the imperialist and reactionary circles designed to complicate the situation on the African continent. The attempts now under way to provoke conflicts and to interfere in the internal affairs of independent African states as well as the continuing build-up by the United States of America of its military presence in Africa constitute an immediate threat to peace and the security of the countries of that region.

The Sides are resolutely opposed to such a policy of imperialism and hegemonism and believe that the process of international detente must be extended to all regions of the world, including Africa. They have spoken out in favour of peace, good-neighbourliness and co-operation on the continent and expressed the confidence that the African peoples will not permit Africa to become an object for intrigues by forces hostile to detente and the cause of peace.

The USSR and the People's Republic of Mozambique declare their determination to work towards making the African continent a nuclear-free zone. They support the desire of the littoral states of the Indian Ocean to make that ocean a zone of peace free from foreign military bases, where no threat is posed to the security, independence and sovereignty of the littoral states. In this light, they advocate implementation of the UN resolution providing for holding in 1981 an international conference on making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace, and decided to do everything to make that important forum a success.

The Sides consider that a prominent role in the cause of safeguarding peace on the continent belongs to the Organisation of African Unity, and advocate a stronger African unity in the face of the intrigues of the forces of imperialism, neo-colonialism and racism. They express the confidence that independent Africa will prove capable of opposing such intrigues.

The Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Mozambique hold that the course pursued by the US ruling circles to disrupt the process of detente and to whip up the arms race seriously aggravates the international situation. They condemn this policy leading to a growth of

international tensions and a greater military threat, and state their determination to continue to pursue the policy of detente and international co-operation, to counteract the designs of imperialist and hegemonist circles posing a threat to the cause of peace. The Sides attach great importance to an early entry into force of the SALT-2 Treaty.

The People's Republic of Mozambique supports the proposals "On Some Urgent Measures for the Lessening of War Danger" tabled by the Soviet Union at the 35th Session of the UN General Assembly. It is convinced that their implementation will contribute to the consolidation of international security. The curbing of the arms race and implementation of effective disarmament measures remains a top-priority task for all those who hold dear peace on earth. Both Sides wish the meeting in Madrid to be crowned with constructive and concrete results. This aim, in the first place, would be served by the achievement at the meeting of an agreement on holding a conference on military detente and disarmament in Europe.

The Sides expressed serious concern over the situation in the Middle East which has resulted from the aggressive actions by Israel and the imperialist forces which support it. The Sides resolutely condemn the US militarist policy designed to strengthen its political and military-strategic positions in that region; they also condemn the Camp David accords and the separate Egyptian-Israeli deal as running counter to the basic interests of the Arab countries and peoples and to the cause of a comprehensive Middle East settlement. They have reasserted that a just and lasting peace in the Middle East can be assured only on condition of a complete withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967, ensuring the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination and independence, including the right to establish its own state, as well as the exercise by all the states of the region of the right to independent existence and security. They stressed that such a settlement can be reached only with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organisation, the sole and legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine.

The Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Mozambique express profound concern over the conflict between Iraq and Iran and advocate an immediate end to the hostilities between them, a political settlement to the conflict on a mutually acceptable basis, without interference in it by any outside forces. They resolutely condemn the

actions by aggressive circles of imperialism in the region of the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf and their expansionist aspirations which carry a threat to the freedom and independence of the peoples of the region.

The Sides declare their solidarity with the struggle of the people of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan defending the gains of the April Revolution, protecting the sovereignty and independence of its country. They speak out in favour of a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan, which must guarantee cessation of all forms of outside interference in the internal affairs of that sovereign country, and declare their complete support for the constructive proposals of the Government of Afghanistan of May 14, 1980.

The Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Mozambique support the struggle of the peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea against imperialism and reaction and their efforts aimed at safeguarding peace in Southeast Asia, at establishing relations of good-neighbourliness and co-operation in the region.

The Sides welcomed the victory of the revolutionary and democratic forces of Nicaragua and expressed their solidarity with the just struggle of the peoples of Chile, El Salvador and other Latin American countries against the oppression and tyranny of the dictatorial regimes imposed and supported by US imperialism.

* * *

The visit to the Soviet Union of the Chairman of the FRELIMO Party, President of the People's Republic of Mozambique Samora Moises Machel at the head of the party and state delegation and the talks held have been a complete success. They constitute an important stage in the development of relations between the two countries and a big contribution to the consolidation of friendship and co-operation between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Mozambique, to the cause of peace and socialism.

Chairman of the FRELIMO Party, President of the People's Republic of Mozambique Samora Moises Machel expressed to the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme So-

viet L. I. Brezhnev profound gratitude for the warm and fraternal reception accorded to him and his delegation.

On behalf of the Central Committee of the FRELIMO Party, the Permanent Commission of the People's Assembly and the Government of the People's Republic of Mozambique, Samora Moises Machel invited General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet L. I. Brezhnev, and Member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR N. A. Tikhonov to come to the People's Republic of Mozambique on an official friendly visit. The invitations were accepted with gratitude. The time of the visits will be agreed upon through diplomatic channels.

*For the Union of
Soviet Socialist
Republics
L. BREZHNEV*

*For the People's
Republic of
Mozambique
S. MACHEL*

Moscow, November 18, 1980

MEETING OF LEADERS OF WTO COUNTRIES

Party leaders and statesmen of the Warsaw Treaty countries held a meeting in Moscow on December 5, 1980.

The participants exchanged opinions on international developments of the preceding several months, and concluded that the course of events had confirmed their previous assessments and the relevance of the proposals advanced at the conference of the Political Consultative Committee of WTO countries in Warsaw in May 1980. The proposals had a beneficial influence on the processes under way in Europe and other regions of the world, and were in harmony with the interests of all peoples.

The participants were gratified to note the active political contacts between states with different social systems; the continuing dialogue on basic international problems; the fruitful examination by the UN General Assembly of the proposals of socialist and other countries aimed at securing rapid and effective limitation and termination of the arms race. All this was contributing to the detente process.

The socialist countries expressed their intention to continue working for a better international climate, consolidation of peace, continuation of detente, expansion of international co-operation, and settlement of all conflicts by negotiation. The participants declared in favour of expanding relations with all countries irrespective of their social system on the principles of independence and sovereignty, renouncing use and threat of force in relations between states, and abiding by the UN Charter.

The participants stressed that they would co-operate with all progressive, democratic and anti-imperialist forces, and that they favoured closer solidarity of all nations in the fight against the war threat and for a policy of peace, for disarmament, notably nuclear disarmament, for detente and equal co-operation.

The participants expressed readiness to conduct relations with the United States of America on constructive lines, provided the new US administration displayed the same approach.

The countries participating in the meeting welcomed the opening of the Madrid conference and hoped that it would open new perspectives for the implementation of the Helsinki accords, for the cause of peace and detente in Europe.

At the same time, the participants noted that the world situation continued to be tense. The arms race was assuming an increasingly dangerous complexion. Seats of military confrontation and tension still existed in various regions of the world. New conflicts were erupting. The situation called for greater vigilance in face of the aggressive designs of imperialist forces and reaction's attempts to impair the positions of the socialist countries, the developing states, and the national liberation movements.

The participants were determined to continue invigorating the unity of the socialist countries on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, internationalist solidarity, and equal mutually beneficial co-operation.

They were confident that the joint efforts of all countries and all peoples interested in peace, security and international co-operation could entrench detente as the leading trend in international affairs.

The participants exchanged information on the progress of socialist and communist construction in their countries. They favoured further development of economic, scientific and technical co-operation, co-ordination of plans in the interests of socialist and communist construction in their countries, and raising the material well-being of their peoples.

Representatives of the Polish United Workers' Party informed the meeting about developments in the Polish People's Republic and the results of the Seventh Plenum of the CC PUWP. The participants expressed their firm belief that the Communists, the working class and all other working people in fraternal Poland would succeed in overcoming the difficulties and in securing the country's further development

along the socialist road. They confirmed that socialist Poland, the Polish United Workers' Party, and the people of Poland could count on the fraternal solidarity and support of the Warsaw Treaty countries. The PUWP representatives declared that Poland would remain a socialist state and faithful member of the family of socialist countries.

The meeting of party leaders and statesmen of the socialist countries passed in an atmosphere of comradely mutual understanding and unity of views.

JOINT SOVIET-INDIAN DECLARATION

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of India,

recalling the relations of close and traditional friendship established between them and expressing the firm resolve of their governments and peoples for the further development of these relations,

aware of their responsibility for the promotion of international peace and noting with concern the deterioration in the present-day international situation,

reiterating their common commitment to the development of co-operation between nations in accordance with the principles of peaceful coexistence,

determined to carry on persistent struggle for peace and international security, national independence of peoples, against all manifestations of imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and apartheid, and for the lofty ideals of mankind recorded in the Charter of the United Nations,

declare their firm intention, in accordance with the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation between the USSR and India, to continue strengthening and deepening Soviet-Indian friendly and mutually beneficial co-operation in the interest of the peoples of the two countries and the cause of international peace and security.

I

The Soviet Union and India note with profound satisfaction that the relations between them which have been fruitfully developing for decades in an atmosphere of friendship and trust, provide an

eloquent example of practical implementation of the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with differing socio-economic systems. These relations are developing to the mutual benefit of the peoples of both countries on the basis of equality and mutual respect, strict observance of sovereignty and non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

The two Sides are convinced that the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation between the Soviet Union and India is a vivid embodiment of the high level of their dynamically developing multifaceted relations and traditional friendship between the peoples of the two countries that constitute an important factor for peace and stability in Asia and the world.

They note with satisfaction the significant progress in the field of their economic, trade and scientific and technical co-operation. Developing on a planned and long-term basis in accordance with the Agreement on Further Development of Economic and Trade Co-operation of November 29, 1973, and the Long-Term Programme of Economic, Trade, Scientific and Technical Co-operation of March 15, 1979, their co-operation makes an essential contribution to the solution of economic problems facing the peoples of the two countries. Thus, the trade turnover between the USSR and India has increased in 1980 more than twice, as compared with 1975, as envisaged in the Joint Soviet-Indian Declaration signed in November 1973, by L. I. Brezhnev and H. E. Shrimati Indira Gandhi.

The Soviet Union will continue to co-operate in the construction of large-scale projects in India and in the development of especially important sectors of its economy. The two Sides are convinced that the agreements concluded during the present visit will provide a new impetus to the development of still closer economic co-operation between them.

The Indian Side appreciates the valuable contributions made by the Soviet Union to India's efforts aimed at self-reliance and its achievements not only in the field of economy but in other important fields as well.

The two Sides reiterate that they attach great significance to the mutual enrichment of their national cultures and strengthening the bonds of friendship and mutual understanding between the peoples of the Soviet Union and India through expanding cultural exchanges and contacts.

II

The Soviet Union and India recognise that their relations of mutual understanding, confidence and all-round co-operation, are of major significance for peace and stability in Asia and in the world. They reaffirm their determination to continue developing these relations and thus to effectively promote the improvement of the international situation.

The Soviet Union and India firmly believe that the most important objective facing mankind is strengthening peace and preventing a new world war and they will do their utmost in contributing towards that lofty end.

The two Sides note with concern the deterioration in the international situation, the persistence of unresolved problems and the emergence of new hotbeds of tension. They call for the maintenance and development of detente and its universalisation.

The Soviet Union and India reaffirm their conviction that inter-state relation should develop on the basis of the fundamental and universally recognised principles such as renunciation of the threat or use of force, respect for sovereignty, equality, territorial integrity, inviolability of borders and non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

The Indian Side gives a high appraisal of the Soviet Union's constructive efforts and proposals aimed at halting the arms race, achieving disarmament and reducing international tensions.

The Soviet Side gives a high appraisal of the significant contribution of India's peaceful foreign policy based on non-alignment to the preservation of international peace and security.

The two Sides note that, in view of the deterioration in the international situation and the escalation of the arms race, there is an urgent necessity for concrete measures aimed at finding solutions to most pressing problems.

The Soviet Union and India are firmly convinced that the priority task facing the world today is halting the arms race, above all in nuclear weapons, and implementing effective measures towards general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Both Sides reiterate their readiness to fully co-operate with each other and with all other states in achieving this goal.

The Soviet Union and India attach great significance to the adoption of immediate measures to halt the arms race, especially in nuclear

weapons, and the effective implementation of these measures. They call for early measures for the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, for the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons and for the prohibition of the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction. A part of the funds which will be released in the process of disarmament should be channelled towards rendering assistance to developing countries.

The Soviet Union and India reaffirm the primary importance they attach to the development of co-operation in the preservation and consolidation of peace and stability in Asia on the principles of peaceful coexistence. They are convinced that the outstanding issues in Asia and the world as a whole can and should be resolved by peaceful means so as to enable the countries of the region to devote their energies to the tasks of national development.

The two Sides emphasise the urgent need for a comprehensive, durable and just settlement of the Middle-east problem based on the complete withdrawal of Israel's forces from all the occupied Arab territories, the satisfaction of the just demands of the Arab people of Palestine and the securing of their legitimate rights, including their inalienable right to the establishment of their own state as well as ensuring the right of all states in the Middle East to independent existence and development.

The two Sides express serious concern over the hotbeds of tensions in Southwest Asia and reaffirm their conviction that the problems of the region demand peaceful political solutions paying full respect to the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-aligned status of the countries of the region. They call upon the countries of the region to expeditiously terminate the armed conflicts, to exercise restraint and co-operate constructively for reducing tension and restoring peace. The Soviet Union and India reiterate their opposition to all forms of outside interference in the internal affairs of the countries of the region. They are confident that negotiated political solution alone can guarantee a durable settlement of the existing problems of the region.

The Soviet Union and India support the desire of the states in Southeast Asia for normalising the situation in that area and for making Southeast Asia a region of durable peace and stability. Both Sides also support the efforts of the countries of Southeast Asia to develop relations of good-neighbourliness and co-operation. The Soviet Union and

India oppose outside interference in the internal affairs of these countries.

The Soviet Union and India reaffirm their readiness to co-operate in the early implementation of the UN Declaration on the Establishment of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and support the resolution of the UN General Assembly on holding a conference in this regard. They call for dismantling all foreign military and naval bases existing in the area, such as Diego Garcia, for preventing the creation of new bases and condemn any attempts to build up foreign military presence in the Indian Ocean under any pretext whatsoever.

The two Sides call for strict implementation of the UN Declaration on the Granting of Independence to the Colonial Countries and Peoples as applied to all territories in the Indian Ocean which are still under colonial domination. They support the just demand of Mauritius for the return of the Chagos Archipelago, including the island of Diego Garcia, to it.

The Soviet Union and India regard the restructuring of international economic relations on a just and democratic basis and the establishment of a new world economic order as one of the most topical tasks. They resolutely condemn any manifestations of the policy of neo-colonialism, discrimination and methods of pressure in inter-state economic relations. The two Sides favour, in particular, the ensuring of fair, stable and equitable prices for the exports of developing countries.

The Soviet Union and India are unanimous in considering that the non-aligned movement is an important factor in maintaining and strengthening peace and in lessening international tension. They take note of the positive role which the non-aligned movement can play in the peaceful settlement of conflict situations in various parts of the world and assess positively the initiatives taken by the non-aligned movement towards this end.

The Soviet Union puts a high value on India's role as an active member of the non-aligned movement in augmenting its contribution to the maintenance of world peace and to the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism, apartheid and every form of domination.

The Soviet Union and India, whose peoples have for centuries been contributing, through their talent and labour, to the development of human civilisation, deem it necessary to draw the attention of all states and peoples of the world to the fact that the course of world events

has brought to the forefront such problems of global importance as rational use of the energy resources of the earth, search for and development of new sources of energy, use of the riches of the World Ocean and the results of the outer space exploration in the interest of all mankind, conservation of nature for the present and future generations, eradication of disease and famine.

III

The Soviet Union and India highly value the happy tradition of maintaining regular contacts on major questions of relations between them and on important international problems of common interest, which serves to deepen Soviet-Indian co-operation in various fields. They will continue the practice of developing contacts and consultations between them at the political level and the further diversification and strengthening of bilateral economic, commercial, scientific, technological and cultural co-operation.

Special significance is attached by the two Sides to Soviet-Indian meetings and contacts at the highest level, which provide an opportunity for reviewing the results and setting new targets in the development of relations between the Soviet Union and India, deepen their mutual understanding and co-operation in the strengthening of international peace. They express profound satisfaction with the results of the official friendly visit of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, L. I. Brezhnev to India, which has in many ways given a new content to traditional Soviet-Indian friendship and co-operation and constituted a significant contribution to the strengthening of international peace and security.

During the visit, the following documents were signed:

1. Agreement on Economic and Technical Co-operation.
2. Trade Agreement for the Years 1981-1985.
3. Programme of Cultural, Scientific and Educational Exchanges for the Years 1981-1982.
4. Protocol on Co-operation in the Field of Cinematography.

L. I. Brezhnev expressed sincere gratitude to the leadership and the people of the Republic of India for the warm welcome accorded to him and his party. He invited the President of India, H. E. Shri Neelam

Sanjiva Reddy, and the Prime Minister of India, H. E. Shrimati Indira Gandhi, to visit the Soviet Union. The invitations were accepted with gratitude.

L. BREZHNEV,
General Secretary
of the Central
Committee of the
CPSU, Chairman
of the Presidium
of the Supreme
Soviet of the USSR

Indira GANDHI,
Prime Minister
of the Republic
of India

/

New Delhi, December 10, 1980

TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP AND CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the People's Republic of the Congo, hereinafter referred to as the High Contracting Parties,

believing that the further development and strengthening of relations of friendship and all-round co-operation between them meet the basic national interests of the peoples of both countries and serve the cause of peace throughout the world;

inspired by the ideals of the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racism in all their forms and manifestations and by the inviolable desire to lend every possible support to the peoples struggling for freedom, independence and social progress;

resolved to facilitate the strengthening of international peace and security in the interests of the peoples of all countries;

coming out for unity of all progressive forces in the struggle for peace, freedom, independence and social progress, and believing that the promotion of friendly relations and co-operation between the socialist and developing countries meets their common interests;

desiring to strengthen and consolidate the relations of friendship and mutually advantageous co-operation, which have taken shape between the two states and peoples, and to create the foundation for their further development;

confirming their loyalty to the aims and principles of the United Nations Charter,

have agreed as follows:

Article 1

The High Contracting Parties will develop and deepen relations of indestructible friendship and all-round co-operation in the political, economic, trade, scientific, technical and cultural fields on the basis of equality, non-interference in internal affairs, respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity, and inviolability of frontiers.

Article 2

The High Contracting Parties will co-operate closely in ensuring conditions for the preservation and further development of the socio-economic gains of their peoples and respect for sovereignty of each of them over all their natural resources.

Article 3

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will respect the policy of non-alignment pursued by the People's Republic of the Congo, which constitutes a major factor contributing to the development of international co-operation and peaceful coexistence.

The People's Republic of the Congo will respect the peaceful foreign policy pursued by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, aimed at consolidating friendship and co-operation with all countries and peoples.

Article 4

The High Contracting Parties will make every effort to safeguard international peace and security, to deepen the process of the relaxation of international tensions, to extend it to all the areas of the world, to implement it in concrete forms of mutually beneficial co-operation among states, and to settle disputable international questions by peaceful means. They will actively promote the cause of universal and complete disarmament, including nuclear, under effective international control.

Article 5

The High Contracting Parties will unswervingly struggle against the forces of imperialism, for the final elimination of colonialism and neo-colonialism, racism and apartheid, and come out for the full implementation of the UN Declaration on the Granting of Independence to the Colonial Countries and Peoples.

The High Contracting Parties will co-operate with each other and with other peace-loving countries in supporting the just struggle of the peoples for their sovereignty, freedom, independence and social progress.

Article 6

The High Contracting Parties will consult each other on all important international questions concerning the interests of both countries.

Article 7

In cases of the emergence of situations posing a threat to peace or violating peace, the High Contracting Parties will enter without delay into contact with each other with a view to co-ordinating their positions in order to remove the threat and to restore peace.

Article 8

The High Contracting Parties will exert every effort to strengthen and expand the mutually beneficial political, economic, social, cultural and scientific and technical co-operation between them. To this end, they will develop and deepen co-operation in spheres which will be the subject of special agreements.

The High Contracting Parties will develop trade exchange and merchant shipping between them on the basis of the principles of equality, mutual benefit and most-favoured-nation treatment.

Article 9

The High Contracting Parties will contribute to the development of the relations of friendship and co-operation between socio-political and cultural organisations of their countries with the purpose of ensuring more profound mutual acquaintance with the life, work, experience and achievements of their peoples.

Article 10

Each of the High Contracting Parties states that it will not participate in any actions or activities directed against the other High Contracting Party.

Article 11

The High Contracting Parties state that this Treaty does not affect their rights and obligations under present international treaties to which they are party and undertake not to conclude any international treaties which are incompatible with it.

Article 12

Any differences that may arise between the High Contracting Parties in the interpretation or application of any provision of this Treaty shall be resolved on a bilateral basis, in a spirit of friendship, mutual respect and understanding.

Article 13

This Treaty shall be effective for 20 years.

If neither of the High Contracting Parties states, six months prior to the expiry of the above-mentioned period, its desire to terminate the Treaty, it will remain effective for the following five years until one of the High Contracting Parties gives notification in writing, six months

prior to the expiry of the current five-year period, of its intention to terminate it.

Article 14

This Treaty is subject to ratification and shall enter into force on the day of the exchange of the ratification instruments, which shall be done in Brazzaville.

Article 15

The High Contracting Parties shall present a copy of this Treaty to the Secretariat of the United Nations for registration.

Done in Moscow on May 13, 1981, in duplicate, each copy in the Russian and French languages, with both texts being equally authentic.

*For the Union
of Soviet Socialist
Republics
L. BREZHNEV*

*For the People's
Republic
of the Congo
D. SASSOU-NGUESSO*

COMMUNIQUE OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE OF MINISTERS OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE WARSAW TREATY MEMBER-STATES

A statutory meeting of the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Member-States of the Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance was held in Bucharest on December 1-2, 1981.

The meeting was attended by Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Bulgaria Pyotr Mladenov, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic Bohuslav Chnoupek, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic Oskar Fischer, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Hungarian People's Republic Frigyes Puja, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Polish People's Republic Jozef Czyrek, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Republic of Romania Stefan Andrei and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics A. A. Gromyko.

The participants held an exchange of information and opinions, and examined the state of arms limitation and disarmament negotiations and the progress of the Madrid meeting of states-participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

1. On behalf of their countries, the Ministers point out that the course of events fully confirms the validity of the assessments and conclusions made by the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee in Warsaw in May 1980 and at the meeting of the leaders of the Warsaw Treaty member-states in Moscow in December 1980 on tendencies observed in the international situation, as well as the importance of the programmes and proposals put forward by these states to further the consolidation of peace, detente, discontinuance of the arms race, disarmament, and the broadening of international co-operation.

They note with profound concern the further deterioration of the in-

ternational climate, the increasing military threat and the growing danger to the freedom and independence of peoples as a result of the imperialist policy of strength. They stress the increasing danger of the quickening pace and growing scale of the arms race, especially nuclear, of the development and introduction of new types and systems of armaments, of the further increase in military spending, of the growing role and influence of the military-industrial complex. They also point out that changes are at work in the development of military technology and these are liable to undermine international stability.

In this connection the participants in the meeting again note the special threat posed by the NATO decision to deploy in Western Europe new American medium-range missiles, and by the US decision on the production of neutron weapons and the broad programme of strategic re-armament with the clearly expressed objective of achieving military superiority. All this is accompanied by the promotion of strategic doctrines threatening the very life of European and other peoples—about delivery of a nuclear first strike, and the possibility and acceptability of a “limited nuclear war” in Europe. Negotiations on many important aspects of arms limitation and disarmament have been either discontinued or frozen.

2. The participants in the meeting point out that the policy of the reactionary imperialist forces working against detente is encountering growing opposition from peace-loving states, anti-imperialist progressive forces, and broad segments of the public in countries of Europe and other areas of the world. An outstanding role in the struggle for peace, the preservation and deepening of detente, for disarmament and co-operation, belongs to the socialist states. Another important factor in this struggle is the actions of the non-aligned countries to prevent war, to consolidate peace, to broaden the process of detente and to make it world-wide. In all states on all continents political figures, parliamentary and public circles, and broad sections of the people resolutely advocate peaceful political settlement of all international disputes; they are increasingly aware of the need for urgent effective steps to avert nuclear catastrophe. Massive anti-war and anti-missile demonstrations and actions for peace and disarmament in countries of Europe and elsewhere in the world have become a sign of the times.

The states represented at the meeting consider that in the present conditions the paramount duty of all states, of all statesmen with any sense of responsibility is to exercise restraint, and to match their ac-

tions with vital need for preserving and consolidating peace, for using the material resources and scientific achievements not for exterminating people and destroying civilisation, but in the interests of resolving socio-economic problems facing the peoples, improving their life and promoting their culture. They declare that the states and statesmen who first resort to nuclear weapons will commit the gravest crime against humanity.

The states represented at the meeting never had, nor ever will have, any strategic doctrine other than a defensive one, and never had, nor ever will have, the intention of creating a first-strike nuclear potential. They do not aspire, nor ever will aspire, to military superiority. They advocate, as they have always advocated, that the military equilibrium should be maintained at a progressively lower level through the implementation of disarmament measures, and that the military confrontation in Europe should be reduced and eliminated.

The states represented at the meeting are convinced that nobody can win the arms race and that the one who resolves to unleash a nuclear war in the hope of scoring a victory in it would incur nuclear catastrophe upon mankind and would also inevitably perish in it. A nuclear war cannot be limited.

3. The participants in the meeting express confidence that at present, as never before, cessation without delay of the arms race and passage to substantial measures of disarmament, especially nuclear, is the most urgent task, indispensable for eliminating the military-political confrontation and the threat of war, for preserving and continuing the process of detente, and for developing co-operation between countries.

They reiterate the continued commitment of their countries to seek agreement on limiting, reducing or prohibiting any type of weapon on a just and reciprocal basis. This applies to nuclear armaments, all types of weapons of mass destruction, and conventional armaments. This also applies to reducing the strength of the armed forces of states.

4. In this connection the participants in the meeting affirm the positive attitude of their states to the resumption of the Soviet-American negotiations on medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. In the context of the question of these negotiations, they note the significance of the recent Soviet-West German summit meeting as an event that contributes to the premises for holding them.

The states represented at the meeting see the aim of the negotiations between the USSR and the USA, which have resumed in Geneva on

November 30, 1981, in consolidating the security of all European states and peoples through a stable balance of forces in Europe at an increasingly lower level of nuclear armaments, in removing the threat to the peoples of the continent. Achievement of this objective requires that all medium-range nuclear systems in Europe (land- and sea-based missiles, and nuclear-capable aircraft and all the factors determining the strategic situation on the continent, should be taken into account.

Creation of a more favourable atmosphere at the negotiations on medium-range nuclear weapons would be facilitated by the establishment—for the duration of the negotiations—of a moratorium on the deployment in Europe of new and the modernisation of existing medium-range nuclear weapons of the two sides. The participants in the meeting note as constructive the readiness expressed by the Soviet Union—given the consent of the other side to the moratorium—to unilaterally reduce, as an act of goodwill, a part of its medium-range nuclear armaments in the European part of the USSR, moving to the lower level on which the USSR and the USA may agree as a result of the negotiations. The meeting also notes the great importance of the Soviet Union's intention to work at the negotiations for a radical reduction by both sides of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe.

The states represented at the meeting also favour arriving at a decision that would envisage complete renunciation by both sides—the East and the West—of all types of medium-range nuclear weapons trained on targets in Europe. They are also in favour of Europe eventually becoming totally free of nuclear weapons—both medium-range and tactical.

This is a sure way to eliminating the threat of war and consolidating peace on the European continent. Considering that the problem of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe concerns all European peoples and that as a result they have a vital stake in concrete results being achieved at the Soviet-US negotiations, the participants in the meeting express the hope that the governments of all European states will contribute to their success.

5. The states represented at the meeting unanimously advocate rapid resumption of the Soviet-US talks on strategic arms limitation. They consider it indispensable that pertinent negotiations, drawing on what has already been achieved in this area and given strict observance of the principle of equality and equal security of the sides, should lead to

limitation and reduction of strategic armaments. This would be of major significance for consolidating international security.

6. The participants in the meeting pronounce themselves in favour of overcoming the stalemate at the Vienna talks on mutual force and armaments reductions and related measures in Central Europe. They are convinced that the proposals of the socialist countries participating in the talks, submitted in 1978-1981 to bring closer the positions, create a good basis permitting the commencement of practical work on the text of the agreement of the first stage. To make headway at the Vienna talks, it is necessary that the Western states participating in them should also manifest the will to solve the problems under discussion and give a constructive reply to the proposals of the socialist countries.

7. The states represented at the meeting declare in favour of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the European continent, including the North of Europe and the Balkans, and also of a zone of peace and co-operation in the area of the Mediterranean Sea.

In this connection the participants in the meeting note that during the creation of nuclear-free zones it is necessary for the nuclear powers to undertake to respect the status of these zones, not to deploy their nuclear arms there, not to use them under any circumstances against the states belonging to the zones, and not to threaten them with the use of such arms. Since the Soviet Union has already stated its readiness to assume such obligations, the peoples of Europe expect the same of other nuclear powers.

The non-nuclear countries belonging to nuclear-free zones also have the right to get guarantees that in accordance with the principle of non-use of force or threats of force no other weapons will be used against them either.

8. The participants in the meeting are resolutely in favour of intensifying the work of all international forums at which talks are being conducted or should be conducted on questions of arms limitation and disarmament, and especially that of the Geneva Disarmament Committee.

They point out that their states are interested in the resumption of all recently interrupted talks, and are ready to facilitate their successful conclusion. This applies to the talks on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, on the prohibition and liquidation of chemical weapons, on the limitation of the sale and delivery

of conventional armaments, on the limitation and subsequent reduction of military activity in the Indian Ocean, and on a number of other questions. It is necessary to speed up the beginning of talks on such questions as ending the production of nuclear arms and liquidating their stockpiles, prohibition of neutron weapons, and non-deployment of nuclear arms on the territory of states that have no such arms at present.

The participants in the meeting resolutely declare for the achievement of practical accords also on the prohibition of radiological weapons, on renouncing the development of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, and on strengthening guarantees of the security of non-nuclear states. They confirm the position of their states in favour of nuclear non-proliferation and access of states to peaceful uses of nuclear energy, as this has been stated in their joint documents.

They stress the readiness of their countries to reach agreement on the reduction of military budgets, first of all those of states possessing a large military potential, either on a percentage basis or in absolute figures. The freezing of military spending by states could be a first step in this direction. The concrete proposals of socialist states on all aspects of this major problem are known and they remain in force.

The meeting stresses the increased urgency of adopting effective measures to prevent the spread of the arms race to outer space, and voices unanimous support for the proposal made by the USSR at the 36th UN General Assembly to conclude an international treaty prohibiting the deployment of any type of arms in outer space.

The states represented at the meeting will continue to press at international level for the prohibition for all time of nuclear weapons and for the renunciation by all states of the use of force in relations with one another, for the dismantlement of foreign military bases and the withdrawal of troops from foreign territories.

9. The participants in the meeting confirm the resolve of their states to continue contributing to the preparations for the forthcoming 2nd Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament in 1982. They express interest in the successful holding of the session, in that its work should be oriented to the adoption of decisions leading in practice to a turn towards ending the arms race, and towards disarmament, and giving new impetus to the talks on these questions. In this connection they note in particular the importance of thoroughly

elaborating an all-embracing programme of disarmament, which is to be considered by the session with the aim of adopting it.

The meeting stresses that all states, irrespective of their size, military potential and geographic location, are called upon to actively facilitate the solution of questions of arms limitation and disarmament, and this also within the framework of the United Nations. The 2nd Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament will offer a good opportunity for this. The participants in the meeting hold that this session should also facilitate the convocation of a world conference on disarmament.

10. When views on the course of the Madrid meeting of states that took part in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe were exchanged, the Ministers stressed that its successful conclusion would facilitate further progress in the realisation of the Helsinki Final Act, assure preservation of the process of detente and contribute to the improvement of inter-state relations. This would be of especially great importance in the present international situation.

In this light the participants in the meeting discussed the actual state of affairs at the Madrid meeting, weighed the results that have already been achieved, including the question of the final document, and the still remaining unsolved questions. They stressed the positive fact that much attention is being given at the meeting to the military aspects of European security, especially to the convocation, in the framework of the European process, of a conference on military detente and disarmament in Europe. They noted the certain drawing together of positions in respect of the aims of that conference, the idea of holding it in stages and the concrete tasks of the first stage, which should be devoted to the consideration and adoption of confidence-building and security measures directed at lessening the danger of military confrontation in Europe. This drawing closer of positions was facilitated to a big extent by the readiness expressed by the Soviet Union to spread the application of confidence-building measures to the entire European part of the USSR given a corresponding expansion of the zone of confidence-building measures by the Western countries.

Confidence was expressed that if all states participating in the Madrid meeting display the necessary political will and realism, it will be possible to reach accord on the convocation of the conference. The states represented at the meeting support the proposal

of the Polish People's Republic to convene the conference in Warsaw.

11. The participants in the meeting attach much importance to the adoption of measures at the Madrid meeting to further assert the principles of inter-state relations formulated in the Final Act, and also to the need for undeviating observance of these principles by all participating states of the European Conference in relations among themselves and with other states.

They express confidence that reaching agreement at the Madrid meeting on further measures to intensify economic, scientific and technological co-operation, including removal of discriminatory obstacles and restrictions, would facilitate implementation of the economic tasks facing each state that participated in the European Conference.

It is noted that the Madrid meeting could reach agreement on further measures to realise the Helsinki accords in the field of culture, education, information and contacts, especially among the youth, on the basis defined in the Final Act.

The participants in the meeting consider it desirable to move forward at the Madrid meeting also in reaching agreement on questions concerning security and co-operation in the Mediterranean area.

The countries represented at the meeting believe that the continuation of joint efforts by states of the European Conference in accordance with the provisions of the Final Act and within the framework of the process started in Helsinki is important and necessary for steady progress in strengthening security and developing co-operation on the European continent. They support the proposal of the Socialist Republic of Romania that the next meeting of representatives of the states participating in the European Conference should be held in Bucharest.

The Ministers unanimously arrived at the conclusion that additional efforts are now needed by all participants in the Madrid meeting to bring it to successful completion.

12. It is of fundamental importance, the meeting notes, that in the interests of preventing any further aggravation of the international situation no steps should be taken to create new and expand existing military-political alliances or spread their activity to new areas. The participants in the meeting also confirm the proposals, repeatedly made by their states, concerning the simultaneous dissolution of the

Warsaw Treaty and the NATO bloc and on the liquidation, as the first step, of their military organisations, starting with mutual reduction of military activity.

13. The states represented at the meeting are convinced that for all the European peoples, irrespective of their social systems, Europe is a common home which should never again become a theatre of military operations and in which each of them should enjoy the boons of peace, independence, progress and well-being.

Despite the great complexity of the present international situation it is possible, by way of a dialogue based on mutual respect and equality and businesslike constructive talks, to achieve a lessening of tension, greater trust in relations between states, and understanding and co-operation between them. No matter how difficult the international questions of the modern world are, there is not one among them that cannot be settled by peaceful means with due account for the interests of all states. This is confirmed by the entire positive experience of political dialogue between states, especially at summit level, including in the most recent time, underscoring the need for such dialogue.

14. The states represented at the meeting hold that the importance of their co-operation and interaction with one another and with other states in the struggle for peace and security is growing still greater in the present international situation. The meeting of the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs passed in a spirit of such co-operation and interaction.

BASIC DOCUMENTS OF IMPORTANT PUBLIC PEACE FORUMS 1980-1981

INTRODUCTION

The attempts of militarist elements in the United States and NATO to upset the prevailing military-strategic equilibrium in their favour have elicited resolute resistance by the public at large, and have set in motion mass actions by those who aspire to peace, detente, and disarmament. Many thousands of people in West European countries, the United States, Canada, and Japan are holding meetings and protest marches, and millions of people are putting their signatures to appeals and statements calling for negotiations to secure peaceful solution of problems and settlement of conflicts.

The contest between the forces of peace and war reaches into practically all echelons of present-day Western society. Discussions rage at government level, within parliaments and political parties, and within public structures such as the trade unions, and women's, youth and student movements, within religious communities, among scientists, writers, artists, etc.

The reckless adventurism of the US Administration and the NATO chiefs is compounded with the massive propaganda offensive they have launched to gain public support by brandishing the lie of a Soviet military threat. To be sure, there is nothing novel about this. As Lenin noted long ago, in capitalist society "popular deception has become a real art in foreign 'affairs' ".¹

But it is one of the important effects of detente, which has for all of a decade exercised a benign influence on world politics, that the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 85.

public is now much better informed about the essence of international affairs. This enables public forces to act more meaningfully, more precisely, focussing their attention on the more urgent, more topical and more vital issues of the day.

Large-scale international forums to discuss the priorities and tasks of the struggle have long since become an important medium of consolidation, joint action and co-ordination of the public anti-war movement.

Indeed, 1980 and 1981, which witnessed a grave deterioration of international relations, were especially bountiful in this respect. The documents of international public forums held in those two years certainly merit attention both in respect to the basic tendencies and common features of the anti-war movement, and in respect to the search of ways and means to make it more active and efficient.

This selection of the documents of the more authoritative international public forums brings to light a few common points in the political platform of the peace forces of the early eighties.

First, the forums and the documents they adopted speak of the extraordinarily wide range of public political forces involved in the anti-war movement of today. It may be said that the "frost" that set in on the international scene has in no way led to a decline in the number of participants in the international dialogue on detente, de-escalation of the arms race, and disarmament.

On the contrary, the situation has given impulse to urgent elaboration of attitudes and priorities concerning a variety of specific issues—strategic arms limitation and the future of SALT-2, the NATO Council decisions of December 1979, the doctrine of "limited" nuclear war, the activation of the US rapid deployment forces, etc.

While still backing the new "tough" posture of US President Ronald Reagan, who moved into the White House in January 1981, to varying degrees, individual members of social-democratic, centrist, and even conservative organisations have nonetheless rejected his line of renouncing dialogue, and chose to participate in public forums and discussions in search of solutions for the newly-arisen problems. This fact speaks clearly for the vitality of the co-operation that grew and gained strength in the public sphere during the period of detente. To safeguard detente is an aim that has, indeed, brought together and solidified an extremely wide range of public forces.

Second, the line of militarisation and the increased adventurism of US foreign policy, and the US leaders' avowed desire to regain "military superiority" have given rise to serious public alarm, especially in Europe, where people have for the first time in many years realised the frightful immensity of the war danger besetting their continent. The decisions to manufacture neutron weapons, like those on siting new US medium-range missiles in Western Europe, have not only provoked mass forms of protest, but have also impelled the public to examine the substance of the problems and to search for political solutions.

This explains the large number of various seminars and symposiums. A whole galaxy of military experts have joined the ranks of peace fighters. Highly popular are the public pronouncements and writings of generals Gert Bastian (FRG), Nino Pasti (Italy), M.H. von Meyenfeldt (Netherlands), Michael Harbottle (Britain), Georgios Koumanakos (Greece), and of admirals James Lee (USA) and Antoine Sanguinetti (France). Important studies were made by the Socialist International Advisory Council on Disarmament and Arms Control headed by Kalevi Sorsa, President of the Social Democratic Party of Finland. The same applies to the currently active and authoritative Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues led by Olof Palme, President of the Social Democratic Labour Party of Sweden.

Third, the Reagan Administration is trying to discredit the public anti-war forces by accusing them of a "one-sided approach", of pacifism and neutralism. Not only does this fail to yield the sought for result, but is tending to create the very opposite effect.

Resolute in its wish for lasting peace, the public inevitably sides with the policy of peace and with those who conduct it. The public backs all concrete steps furthering peace and rejects all decisions that augment the danger of war. As past and present efforts show, therefore, it is highly important for the peace forces to have a peace policy to lean upon—the peace policy of the countries of the socialist community. That is an important factor of success.

This point is clearly proved by the attitude of the world public to the question of nuclear arms limitation in Europe. On the eve of the Soviet-US negotiations on this score, President Reagan came out with his "zero option", requiring the Soviet Union to unilaterally destroy its medium-range missiles. But the public in Europe and elsewhere saw through the deception of this "peace move" at once. The move, mainly designed, as the US press admitted, for the peace movement "to

let off steam" and to quench its fervour, collapsed like a house of cards.

On the other hand, the public gave its warm support to the new peace proposals made by Leonid Brezhnev during his visit to the FRG in November 1981 and also in his speech at the 17th Congress of Soviet Trade Unions in March 1982, seeing them as an answer to its own hopes and aspirations. The peace forces accepted them as a true and fair "zero option" that would relieve Europe of both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons.

The constructive Peace Programme for the 80s launched by the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union made a great impression on the entire anti-war movement. In furtherance of this programme, the CPSU is backing the efforts to build a truly world-wide coalition of anti-war forces, and has declared its readiness to fight for the elimination of the threat of a nuclear conflict hand in hand with other political forces and organisations: "We claim no monopoly in the matter of consolidating peace," said Leonid Brezhnev in his speech in Kiev on May 9, 1981.

At various international public forums, Soviet representatives show their readiness to co-operate with all sections of the present-day anti-war movement, and this in the firm belief that in a movement sustained by the noblest of all aims there must be no adversaries, and only partners.

The documents of public forums published between these covers reflect all the specific features of the present phase of the peoples' struggle for peace. Each of them has in its own way helped to consolidate the public forces on a common anti-war platform. Nonetheless, the leading place among them belongs by all rights to the documents of the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace which convened in Sofia in September 1980. The Appeal and Charter of the Sofia Parliament of the Peoples was warmly received by peace fighters all over the world. More, they materialised in deeds of great magnitude, for 1981 really became a year of great public anti-war actions.

Also meriting attention is the modest-sized Communique of the International Conference Against the Arms Race and for Disarmament held in Stockholm in June 1981. The composition of the Conference speaks for itself: among its participants were organisers and activists of mass anti-war actions, those whose stand for co-operation has led to direct joint action of public organisations of various countries.

Note should also be taken of the Final Document of the World Forum of Youth and Students for Peace, Detente and Disarmament, which gathered in Helsinki in January 1981. The twists and turns in world affairs are, indeed, most sharply reflected in the youth movement. The Helsinki forum showed that virtually all the political currents in the contemporary youth movement, with the exception of its obviously reactionary and extremist groups which were not invited and did not participate in it, spoke out in no uncertain terms for continued detente, for limitation of the arms race, and for disarmament.

Y. F. Kharlamov

FOR THE CONTINUATION OF DETENTE AND EUROPEAN CO-OPERATION

Communique of the International Committee for European Security and Co-operation

Brussels, March 20-21, 1980

Representatives of European public opinion who took part in the session of the International Committee for European Security and Co-operation that gathered in Brussels on March 20 and 21, 1980, expressed their concern over the recent deterioration of the international situation and their firm resolve to prevent this from prejudicing detente and the implementation of the Helsinki Final Act.

It is in the interests of the peoples of Europe to do everything in their power to avert a renewal of cold war.

The danger of a confrontation increases with the acceleration of the arms race and the incitement of war hysteria.

Attempts to undermine detente, which was achieved through the efforts of all the states that took part in the Helsinki Conference, the plans of stationing new arsenals of nuclear missiles in Europe, the violation of already concluded agreements, and the suspension of negotiations—all this is disrupting political, economic, scientific, cultural, humanitarian, and sports relations.

The 35th anniversary of the victory over fascism should remind people in Europe and the rest of the world of the true price of peace, and calls for still more resolute actions to safeguard it and to consolidate political detente by effective measures in the domain of military detente. Participants in the session consider it very important that, in these circumstances, the peace forces of Europe should use all their potentialities in order to demand:

- implementation of the recommendations of the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament;
- ratification of the SALT-2 Treaty and effective measures to re-

duce nuclear weapons in Europe in accordance with the principles of equality and the undiminished security of all the countries concerned;

- effective progress at the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe;

- support of the proposals of some states to convene a conference on military detente and disarmament in Europe (an invitation to hold it in Warsaw has already come from Poland, and another has come from Sweden to hold it in Stockholm);

- conclusion of a European treaty on the non-use of force, applying to first use of nuclear as well as conventional arms;

- a constructive approach to the Madrid meeting so as to secure new progress in the full implementation of the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act by all signatory states, notably those concerning reinforcement of political by military detente and by concrete disarmament measures, including confidence-building measures; convocation of a meeting of representatives of the European public in support of these objectives;

- a firm riposte to all attempts at unilaterally rupturing or reducing co-operation in the political, economic, cultural, humanitarian and sports domains (such as the attempts to torpedo the 1980 Olympic Games) which contradict the wishes and vital interests of the European peoples; extension by all possible means of contacts and relations among the peoples of Europe established thanks to detente and to the application of the Helsinki provisions; settlement by peaceful means of ongoing conflicts (notably this refers to the situation created in Cyprus contrary to the UN resolutions and in violation of the Helsinki accords).

The International Committee for European Security and Co-operation addresses itself on the eve of the fifth anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act to all political and public forces that are in favour of European security and co-operation, and calls for the continuation of detente and of dialogue on topical international problems in order to surmount by common effort the obstacles to disarmament and peace.

We want no cold war and no confrontation; we want detente and co-operation among the peoples.

ATTENTION: WAR DANGER!

Appeal of the Session of the WPC Presidential Committee

Budapest, May 8-10, 1980

The peoples of the world have been challenged; detente is being jeopardised, the arms race is being stepped up, paving the way to war.

This challenge must be rebuffed. Let us resume the dialogue, restore mutual confidence and take resolute action.

Today, on the 35th anniversary of the victory over Hitlerite fascism and of the end of the Second World War in Europe, the World Peace Council makes this solemn appeal:

To all those who on the ruins and ashes pledged to do their utmost to prevent another holocaust,

To all those who denounce the insanity of the arms race,

To all those who are deeply concerned about the ever more frequent recourse to force in international relations,

To the young people who claim the right to live in a peaceful world,

To all peoples and governments of the world.

Attention: war danger!

War is not inevitable; it is not too late to halt the unbridled build-up of armaments, and, above all, to prevent the establishment of new nuclear arsenals in the heart of Europe; it is high time to finish with the policy of violence and threats, blockades, embargoes, boycotts and armed provocation.

It is the duty of each and everyone of us to save detente to give new impetus to disarmament negotiations, and to bring about a just and reasonable restructuring of international economic relations.

No ideological, political or religious differences must impede open dialogue and concerted action by all those who are disturbed by the sharp deterioration of the international situation.

Put aside that which divides us; strive for that which unites us. We call for joint action to avoid a new world war!

May 10, 1980

COMMUNIQUE OF THE INTERNATIONAL FORUM-DIALOGUE FOR DISARMAMENT AND DETENTE

Vienna, May 26-28, 1980

The International Forum-Dialogue for Disarmament and Detente, organised by the International Liaison Forum of Peace Forces jointly with the Austrian Co-ordinating Committee for Peace Work, took place in Vienna from 26 to 28 May, 1980.

The Forum was attended by participants from 38 countries, including prominent personalities from 62 political parties (social-democratic, christian-democratic, conservative, communist, socialist, centrist, radical, liberal and democratic parties from Europe, America and Australia, and national parties from Asia and Africa), trade unions, peace movements, religious groups and other organisations.

Mr. Jan Martenson, Assistant Secretary-General of the UN and head of the UN Centre for Disarmament, informed the participants of the efforts of that world organisation in 1980 to facilitate the ending of the arms race and to promote disarmament, in particular by implementing the recommendations of the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament in 1978.

Participants in the Dialogue share the deep concern of all peoples at the grave dangers of war resulting from the recent aggravation of the world situation, and the unprecedented acceleration of the arms race, the increase of tensions and confrontations.

In an open and thorough discussion different viewpoints were expressed on a great range of problems and events. This included the discussion on regional tensions and conflicts existing in the world, such as those in Iran, Afghanistan and elsewhere.

Participants in the Dialogue stressed the seriousness of the dangers arising from the existing tensions, the regional arms build-up and actions threatening the sovereignty and independence of nations in

Central America and the Caribbean. Concern was also expressed with regard to similar dangers in the Middle East and in Southeast Asia.

Emphasis was also placed on the dangers arising from the present massive arms build-up in the Persian Gulf, the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean. Speakers on these issues gave support to the efforts for political solutions through negotiations involving all states concerned.

There was agreement that efforts aimed at the disruption of mutually beneficial economic, scientific, technical, cultural, sports and other relations among states, the resort to threats and blackmail, boycotts, embargo, blockade and other forms of hostile actions and confrontations accompanied by cold-war propaganda campaigns, were increasingly obstructing solution of international problems.

Any further delay in ratifying the SALT-2 Treaty, adoption of new long-term military programmes, and deployment of new medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe are measures threatening to upset the present relative military equilibrium in Europe and the world and to open a new and highly dangerous round of the arms race.

There was agreement that the following steps would be important contributions to improving the international climate:

- suspension of the decision to deploy new nuclear missiles in Europe, which would enable negotiations on mutual reductions of medium-range missiles to be initiated,
- ratification of the SALT-2 Treaty,
- agreements at the talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe,
- general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests,
- establishment of nuclear-free zones,
- prohibition of chemical weapons and destruction of existing stocks,
- guarantees to be given by all countries possessing nuclear weapons not to use them against those countries which have no nuclear weapons of their own and have none on their territory.

The need to implement the recommendations contained in the final document of the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament was stressed. The participants particularly appealed for the opening of serious talks on such vital measures as a world treaty on the non-use of force, a treaty to stop the manufacture of nuclear

arms and to gradually reduce their stocks until their complete elimination, and a treaty banning the development of new types and systems of weapons of mass annihilation.

The aggravation of the international situation in various parts of the world is affecting relations in Europe. This, however, cannot justify any disruption of the process of detente in Europe or serve as a new obstacle to curbing the arms race. On the contrary, detente, security and co-operation in Europe must serve as impetus for peaceful relations between nations everywhere in the world. Stress was laid in this connection on the positive significance of the recent Soviet-French summit meeting in Warsaw, which shows the possibility of constructive talks to overcome tensions. /

There was general agreement that the meeting of the signatory states of the Helsinki Final Act, in Madrid in November 1980, will be an important opportunity to consolidate the detente process in Europe. In order to make this meeting a success, it is necessary to make constructive preparations and ensure an atmosphere of confidence and mutual understanding. The International Forum welcomed activities planned by some non-governmental organisations to mobilise public opinion and to formulate proposals encouraging achievement of positive results at the Madrid meeting.

Given a constructive approach and goodwill by all participating states, the Madrid meeting could take practical measures for the calling of a Conference on Military Detente and Disarmament in Europe. This Conference should consider important questions, such as strengthening and further expanding confidence-building measures, renunciation of use and threats of force, and reduction of armed forces and armaments with the aim of securing equilibrium at ever lower levels of military strength.

Participants also discussed and expressed support for recent proposals to reduce tensions and to promote negotiations, in particular the holding of a meeting of heads of state and government from all parts of the world; efforts to achieve an agreement by which all states in Europe would undertake not to increase their armed forces in the area defined by the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference; negotiations with a view to limiting and reducing military presence and military activity in important Ocean areas of the world (the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian oceans, the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf, and elsewhere), in order to safeguard unhampered use of crucial maritime routes.

The participants discussed in depth the problems relating to disarmament, detente and the mass media. They stressed the necessity for broader and more objective information, warned against the manipulation of minds and against the effects of inciting war hysteria. They stressed the importance of the 1978 UNESCO Declaration on the Role of Mass Media. Special attention was devoted to education in the spirit of peace, which should be improved in all countries.

Participants welcomed the joint statement issued on behalf of all Turkish, Greek and Cypriot political parties represented at the Forum. The statement included a call for Cyprus to be fully independent and sovereign; for its territorial integrity, non-alignment and full demilitarisation, with the withdrawal of all foreign troops and the removal of all foreign bases from its territory, and for the implementation of the United Nations resolutions on Cyprus.

Support was expressed for the efforts of the peoples of southern Africa fighting racism and apartheid.

The participants recognised the growing significance of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries in the fight for disarmament and development. They expressed their warm appreciation of the important contribution of neutral countries, notably Austria, to the cause of peace and international security.

The participants voiced their satisfaction over the exchange of views which had taken place at the Forum and expressed appreciation to their Austrian hosts for facilitating the meeting. They also paid tribute to the favourable atmosphere in Vienna, where the 25th anniversary of the signing of the Austrian State Treaty had just been celebrated, for important steps towards detente. They voiced the hope that Austria will in future, too, serve as a place for meetings devoted to exchanges of views and constructive efforts for detente and disarmament, which will also facilitate continued and broader work by the International Forum.

The participants in the Vienna Forum strongly supported continued and extended dialogue on issues of disarmament and detente by the International Liaison Forum of Peace Forces. The Forum should be open to the widest possible range of political parties and international non-governmental organisations.

The Vienna Forum appealed to all political parties in all countries to join in the preparations for the World Conference-Dialogue for Disarmament and Detente, to be held in 1981.

TO THE PARLIAMENTARIANS OF THE WORLD

Appeal of the International Conference of Parliamentarians for Peace, Disarmament and International Security

Helsinki, May 30-June 1, 1980

The International Conference of Parliamentarians for Peace, Disarmament and International Security, convened on the initiative of the World Peace Council on May 30-June 1, 1980, and attended by members of parliament, mayors and deputies of provincial bodies from all continents:

draws the attention of the peoples most urgently to the gravity of the present international situation;

calls upon parliamentarians of all countries to exert every effort for joint action to save the world from the danger of a new war, to stop the further aggravation of tension, the acceleration of the arms build-up, and attempts to reverse the process of detente in international relations;

expresses full support for the efforts of those statesmen who stand for the continuation of a constructive dialogue, re-establishment of mutual confidence and removal from international relations of everything that impedes this process;

calls upon parliamentarians of all countries to do everything in their power to promote: ratification of the Soviet-American SALT-2 Treaty; the general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests; the prohibition of chemical weapons and destruction of their stockpiles; guarantees of the security of non-nuclear states; conclusion of a world treaty prohibiting the use of force or threat thereof in international relations; the ending of the production of nuclear weapons and gradual reduction of their stocks, up to their complete liquidation under effective international control; the prohibition of the development of new

types and new systems of weapons of mass destruction, and the reduction of military budgets;

attaches special significance to strict adherence to the principles laid down in the UN Charter and the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, and *calls* for the implementation of all provisions of the Final Act. An important role in this respect can and must be played by the forthcoming meeting to be held in Madrid in November 1980. To make the meeting a success it is necessary to contribute in every way possible to preparing it well and holding it in a constructive atmosphere. In this connection the results of the Fourth Inter-Parliamentary Conference on European Co-operation and Security, which met in Brussels in May 1980, deserve attention;

supports the idea of convening a conference of the states participating in the CSCE activity on military detente and disarmament in Europe, giving favourable consideration to the offer of the Polish People's Republic to convene such a conference in Warsaw;

considers timely and important the proposal that a meeting of the leaders of states of all regions of the world should be held at the highest level. The most important task of this meeting would be the prevention of war and the elimination of hotbeds of international tension;

disapproves of the production and deployment in Europe of all kinds of new weapons of mass destruction and deplores the decision of the Brussels session of the NATO Council on the production and deployment of a new generation of US medium-range nuclear missiles and calls for abolishing or at least suspending the realisation of this decision, so as to open the way for negotiations;

expresses deep anxiety over the fact that the present deterioration of the international situation raises ever new obstacles to the restructuring of international economic relations on a foundation of equality and justice, and *strongly condemns* the role of transnational corporations and all encroachments on the exercise of the right of nations to free and independent development and full sovereignty over their natural and raw material resources;

welcomes the convening in August 1980 of the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on the New International Development Strategy;

supports the struggle of the peoples of the world against foreign

domination, all forms of racism and apartheid, colonialism, neo-colonialism, imperialism and hegemonism;

strongly condemns all recourse to force or threat of force in international relations;

expresses its full support for the Budapest Appeal issued by the World Peace Council and *calls for* world-wide common action against the war danger;

expresses warm support for the initiative to hold the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace in Sofia on September 23-27 this year, and calls upon parliamentarians and members of provincial and municipal authorities to contribute in every possible way to the preparation of this major forum of the peace forces. /

CHARTER OF THE WORLD PARLIAMENT OF THE PEOPLES FOR PEACE

Sofia, September 23-27, 1980

The World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace in Sofia, the capital of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, is meeting at this decisive moment of greatly increased war danger. Its 2,260 participants: representatives of various mass organisations, movements and political parties, scientists, cultural and church, public and political figures,

expressing the will and aspirations to peace of their compatriots from 137 countries;

deeply *alarmed* by the deteriorating world situation and the greatly increased tendency to use force or the threat of force; boycotts, blockades, and psychological warfare which poisons international relations;

profoundly *disturbed* by the unrestrained growth of armaments in the world and indignant at the irresponsible policies aimed at their still more intensive build-up;

concerned at the fact that vital social, economic and political problems are being exacerbated as a result of the rapid growth of military expenditure,

have, after wide and open discussion, arrived at general conclusions regarding the principal goals and objectives of the peace forces in the present situation, and have set them out as follows:

1 The Peoples Have the Inalienable Right to Live in Peace

To live in peace is a sacred and inalienable right of every human being and of every nation. Peace is mankind's common priceless possession, the main condition and prerequisite of progress.

Social, economic and political rights can only be implemented if the right to live in peace is secured.

Any encroachment on this sacred right—the planning, preparing and unleashing of war—is the gravest crime against humanity.

The authors of the so-called “new nuclear strategy”, based on the monstrous doctrine of a “limited” nuclear war are guilty of this crime against humanity. No “limited”, “local” or “protracted” nuclear war is possible. It will inevitably lead to general nuclear holocaust.

Bellicose forces have exposed mankind to the acute threat of a new round of the arms drive, far more dangerous and wasteful than any so far. Attempts to achieve military superiority are not only senseless, but also extremely dangerous, because they can raise the arms race to a qualitatively new level where it may get out of any possible control.

Nuclear weapons and all other means of mass destruction must be banned.

It is essential to fight against the nuclearisation of racist, dictatorial and reactionary regimes which threaten the independence of neighbouring states and world peace.

To stop the arms build-up is an imperative need. The only way to curb the arms race is through negotiations on the basis of strict observance of the principle of equality and equal security for all. There is no alternative to this!

In order that this right to peace is secured, we demand:

— early ratification and implementation of SATL-2 and continuation of strategic arms limitation talks;

— negotiations on medium-range nuclear weapons, including forward-based systems, to start at once;

— simultaneous dissolution of military alliances, including the simultaneous dissolution of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, and dismantlement of all foreign military bases;

—restoration of trust between states, which had considerably advanced detente in the seventies.

A great responsibility rests on the participants in the Madrid meeting of states—signatories to the Helsinki Final Act—to work in this spirit and to contribute positively towards these goals. Of particular importance would be a concrete decision to convene a conference on military detente and disarmament in Europe.

2 The Right to Peace Is the Right to National Independence, to Free and Peaceful Development of All Peoples

The peoples demand lasting and just peace giving them the full right to choose their own way of development, to establish a social and political system in conformity with their wishes. Any policy aimed at depriving people of this right is an imperialist policy. It runs counter to the natural course of historical progress and is inherently reactionary.

All peoples must enjoy equal opportunities for social and economic development.

Elimination of all forms of discrimination, of all artificial barriers in world trade, of all forms of inequality, diktat and exploitation in economic relations, and establishment of just and equal international economic relations are the basic right of humankind.

The policy of destabilisation of progressive regimes in developing countries actually constitutes an aggression, waged with psychological, economic, political and other means, including armed intervention. This is a violation of the right to peace.

Hotbeds of tension threaten the security, freedom and independence of nations in different regions. At the same time, they give impetus to new rounds of arming, poison the international climate and undermine detente.

Interference in the internal affairs of other states sharply conflicts with the right of all peoples to peaceful, free and independent development.

The present-day aggravation of international tensions is an obvious reversion to the old imperial policy of world domination. For this pur-

pose various parts of the world are proclaimed "zones of vital interest", "rapid deployment forces" are created, thus endangering peace, national independence and the freedom of peoples.

The lack of real progress in the realisation of a new international economic order is to be traced to the fact that the imperialist powers and the transnational corporations are unwilling to give up their privileged positions, as was convincingly manifested at the last UN Special Session on Development.

3 Detente, Democracy, Freedom and Social Progress

The cold war, hostile confrontation and war hysteria hinder humanity's social progress and impede the complete implementation of fundamental human rights and freedoms. Those who gain from this are the forces of reaction and aggression that reap profits from arms production.

The constant growth of military expenditures is being paid for by the working people. It causes galloping inflation, tax increases, and unemployment. Experience shows that militarisation of the economy does not only fail to create new jobs, but also reduces employment and entails cuts in health, education, culture, and other social services.

It is necessary to put an end to the criminal business of the producers and merchants of armaments. Conversion of military production to civilian is feasible, profitable and absolutely indispensable.

The existence of racist regimes and fascist dictatorships which trample underfoot democracy and the elementary rights and freedoms of their peoples is abhorrent to human conscience. Militarism and international tensions are factors that create favourable conditions for carrying out anti-democratic coups and for the survival of fascist juntas and anti-popular dictatorial regimes.

The whipping up of war hysteria, of hatred against other countries, and all propaganda campaigns aimed at creating suspicion and mistrust is contrary to the interests of all peoples. Mass media must serve the cause of peace and not the military-industrial complexes, and must not confuse public opinion with lies and misinformation.

Those who are responsible for the education of the rising generation must stand for the ideals of peace, friendship, solidarity and respect for all nations.

4 Peace Is Our Common Just Cause

War is not inevitable! Peace can be maintained and strengthened!

However, no country, no nation, no party or organisation is able to achieve this on its own. Only by our common struggle can we put an end to the criminal conspiracies against world peace. There is no other alternative!

Let nothing divide us in our joint struggle for the survival of humanity! Let the power of world public opinion be fully manifested to stop the activities of those who are pushing humanity ever closer to the nuclear abyss!

Let the voice of the peoples for peace be heard as never before in mass demonstrations, petitions, appeals to parliaments and governments, in united actions on a national and international scale!

The time has come for people of all countries who create the wealth of this world to speak out in defence of peace and the future of humanity!

Let us support the efforts of those governments which are guided by reason, realism and goodwill, and stand for detente and disarmament!

Let us support the efforts of the non-aligned movement which, with its great anti-militaristic potential, plays a more and more active role in securing world peace!

Let us support the measures taken by the United Nations and other inter-governmental organisations to curb the arms race, to ensure peace and security of all nations and to establish a new international economic order! Let us work for the implementation of the recommendations of the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament, and for the early convocation of a World Disarmament Conference!

May the coming Week of Action for Disarmament, October 24 to 30, and the subsequent joint or parallel actions of political parties,

trade unions, women's, youth and student organisations, and religious, cultural and scientists' associations demonstrate the peoples' firm resolve to remove the danger of war!

The year 1981 must become the starting point for a resolute offensive of the peace forces of the eighties for conclusive progress in halting the build-up of armaments!

September 27, 1980

APPEAL OF THE WORLD PARLIAMENT OF THE PEOPLES FOR PEACE

The peoples of the world are alarmed. Never before has there been so great a danger of world nuclear holocaust.

The nuclear arms build-up, the accumulation of deadly arsenals, have reached a critical point. Further escalation of the arms build-up could create a most dangerous situation, threatening humanity with extermination.

The "new nuclear strategy" is an elaborate deception to persuade the peoples that limited or regional nuclear war can be conducted without leading to global nuclear holocaust. We categorically reject this dangerous and inhuman concept!

Peoples everywhere, who have for more than three decades successfully prevented a world war and who have so devotedly struggled for disarmament and detente, refuse to be party to these schemes. They demand to stop the arms build-up, to stop the sabre-rattling, to stop aggression and the threat of aggression, and to avert the danger of nuclear war.

We appeal to the reason and to the sense of responsibility of all politicians and statesmen, we appeal to the governments:

Renounce the new arms programmes! Halt the manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction—nuclear missiles and neutron, chemical and all other weapons! Reduce the arms stockpiles! Ban nuclear weapons! Negotiate! There is no other choice!

We appeal to all those who cherish peace!

To express concern is not enough! To raise the alarm is not enough! The peoples are able to safeguard peace, which is their basic right! Act now! Let our voice ring out louder than ever before!

Let us stop those who are seeking to push the world over the brink!

Let us put aside all that divides us and join hands to defeat the menace of nuclear war!

Adopted on September 24, 1980, by 2,260 participants in the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace representing 137 countries and more than 100 international organisations.

DECLARATION OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE PUBLIC DIALOGUE ON MADRID-1980

Brussels, November 21-22, 1980

The Dialogue on Madrid-80, which took place in Brussels on November 21 and 22, 1980, on the initiative of the International Committee for European Security and Co-operation, was attended by representatives of 21 European countries and 13 international organisations.

A deep-going exchange of opinions ensued following communications concerning the activity of such diverse organisations as the Information Centre and Liaison Bureau of the United Nations in Brussels, the Inter-Parliamentary Union, the Socialist International, and the Framework for All-European Youth and Student Co-operation.

Welcoming the opening of the Madrid meeting of the 35 states that signed the Helsinki Final Act, and expressing their accord with basic provisions set forth in the pamphlet *From Helsinki to Madrid* put out by the International Committee for European Security and Co-operation, the participants agreed to declare the following:

1. European public opinion is alarmed at the continually growing war danger, marked by such disquieting signs as the intensification of the arms build-up, coupled with the perfection of nuclear arsenals, and the appearance of doctrines that admit of a "limited" nuclear war. The fact that a nuclear conflict, even if limited, would entail the destruction of Europe, should cause governments to renounce use of force and to resolve their conflicts exclusively by negotiation. Negotiations should not be subject to any preliminary conditions or conducted as "negotiations from positions of superiority".

The attempts to present preventive and limited nuclear war as "inevitable, profitable or attractive" on the pretext of the latest technical

progress, are simply criminal. Such pleas cannot alter the fact that a nuclear first strike entails the risk of developing into holocaust.

Such holocaust, should it occur, would originate in Europe, and it is therefore the European nations and governments that bear special responsibility for averting its menace.

The most urgent task of all is to ensure the success of the inter-governmental meeting in Madrid in the spirit of the Final Act solemnly signed in Helsinki in 1975.

2. Despite differences of opinion on various questions, notably the important problem of human rights, it is essential that the participating states should succeed in resuming truly constructive dialogue, reasserting their political will for detente, restoring confidence, and holding down the perilous acceleration of the arms race, and this particularly by rapidly securing a negotiated termination of the deployment of Euro-strategic nuclear arms.

A decision to convene a conference on military detente and disarmament in Europe would be an essential step by the Madrid meeting towards solving these problems.

The public demands that the governments should come to terms concerning specific measures of co-operation in the political, economic and humanitarian fields.

That is why, in concluding their work, the participants in the Brussels dialogue address themselves hopefully to the 35 governments, and to various political parties and public forces, calling on them to act in full consciousness of their responsibility and to ensure the success of the meeting in Madrid.

FINAL DOCUMENT OF THE WORLD FORUM OF YOUTH AND STUDENTS FOR PEACE, DETENTE AND DISARMAMENT

Helsinki, January 19-23, 1981

1. We, the participants of the World Forum of Youth and Students for Peace, Detente and Disarmament, want to express our deep concern with the current situation in the world:

— we are experiencing a new round of the arms race, especially of the nuclear arms race, and the process of detente is in danger; we are threatened not only by a new cold war with intensified confrontation between the military blocs and with a growing involvement of new states, particularly some developing ones, in the increased military build-up, but also, in the worst case, by a new world war;

— in many parts of the world economic and social injustice continues to grow and human rights as described in the UN conventions are still not respected; the hunger and poverty of huge masses of people are still a disgrace upon humanity; the waste of material and human resources and the damaging of our environment are growing to more and more serious proportions throughout the world.

2. As young people we feel that a world of confrontation offers no future. If the positive achievements in the process of detente are not taken further and negative trends in international relations are not removed, if the constructive co-operation among our nations is not deepened, if a halt is not called to the arms race, the prospects for youth and the whole world are grim. We strive for the consolidation and the carrying on of the process of detente and its geographical extension. Young people all over the world regardless of their ideological, political and religious convictions or social background want to work to ensure their future in a world of peace. We are participating in this Forum in order to demonstrate our commitment to the devel-

opment of a more positive international atmosphere, and it is our conviction that this can be achieved. We believe that communicating more actively with each other on the basis of mutual respect, in a manner which allows full expression of our agreements and differences so that we can discover common ground, is a process which helps to advance world peace.

3. We express our commitment to the continuation and deepening of detente. We demand general and complete disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, under effective international control.

According to the principles governing inter-state relations, as stipulated in the Charter of the United Nations, we want to do our best to prevent war and military actions from being used as a means of settling international disputes and demand that the use and threat of force should be banned in international relations.

We oppose any violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of states, as well as of the right of peoples to self-determination; we demand that the interests of national security of the peoples be respected.

4. We want a world where equity, full equality, national sovereignty, common interests and co-operation among all states, irrespective of their economic and social systems, should be secured. We want a world based on a new international economic order, where the widening gap between the developed and the developing countries should be eliminated. We want to establish, ensure and enlarge the economic, social and other human rights of present and future generations and the right of all peoples to national independence, democracy and self-determination. We want a world without waste of natural resources, where human society is in ecological harmony with nature.

5. We demand action instead of words. Important programmes like the Final Document, particularly the Programme of Action of the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament, should be carried out.

6. Our great ideals can be achieved only in a world of peace and detente based on full equality and sovereignty of nations, where military confrontation and the threat of a nuclear catastrophe are eliminated.

7. We reject all ideas of a "limited nuclear war". In today's world a nuclear war can only lead to total catastrophe.

8. We demand urgent new steps forward both in the nuclear and conventional disarmament process. We emphasise the role of the UN

in promoting disarmament and demand that a comprehensive programme on disarmament should be finalised. One important step forward is the ratification and complete implementation of the SALT-2 Treaty. We are for the continuation and extension of the SALT process aimed at the quantitative reduction and qualitative limitation of strategic arms.

9. The limitation of nuclear armaments requires strengthening of the regime of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons on the basis of complete adherence of all states to, and full implementation of, all provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and realisation of a total ban on nuclear weapon tests. We call for a multilateral treaty banning development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons. Peaceful uses of nuclear energy must not lead to any further proliferation of nuclear weapons.

10. We recognise the importance of various regional disarmament measures and regard the establishment of nuclear-free and demilitarised zones as a valuable contribution to the process of disarmament and the strengthening of the security of the respective countries. We are against any attempt to create military bases and alliances. We oppose the idea of a South Atlantic Treaty Organisation and support the conversion of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. We also demand a halt to the military build-up in the Mediterranean and call for its transformation into a zone of peace.

11. We call for steps leading to the abolition of military blocs and the reduction of national armies, the dismantling of all foreign military bases and demand an all-round reduction of military expenditures based on internationally agreed definitions of what constitutes a military budget. The development of new weapons of mass destruction gives momentum to the arms race, deepens mutual distrust, and hampers the realisation of measures aimed at disarmament.

Special attention was called to the necessity for finding the earliest possible solution to the problems arising from the production and deployment of new, and for reducing already existing, medium-range nuclear missiles related to the European continent. This solution must be based on the principles of equality and equal security of all the parties concerned.

12. The situation in Europe—the continent with the highest accumulation of arms, including nuclear arms—is of special concern to the young generation because of its serious impact on the entire world

situation. We therefore call for the strengthening of detente and co-operation in Europe on the basis of the full implementation of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. We call for concrete steps forward in all ongoing disarmament negotiations, and support the convocation of a Conference on Military Detente and Disarmament in Europe through the CSCE process and the furthering of confidence-building measures.

13. Instead of an arms build-up which aggravates the existing economic and social problems, we demand efforts to convert military production into more intensive civilian production. Resources, particularly those freed by the disarmament measures, could assist in the solution of the global problems of humanity, including satisfaction of the needs of the developing countries and abolition of social and economic injustices. We demand negotiations on the limitation of the arms trade. We demand that a practical approach and a spirit of goodwill should permeate all negotiations aiming at the establishment of a new international economic order, and the further elaboration of the international development strategy on the basis of the pertinent UN resolutions. We highly appreciate the efforts of non-aligned countries in this regard.

14. Securing world peace calls for the settling of many international and regional problems and injustices. We express our deep concern at the deterioration of the situation in the Middle East where the discrimination and oppression of the Palestinian people continues. The situation necessitates immediate Israeli withdrawal from all occupied territories, so that the Palestinian people should be able to achieve their inalienable and legitimate right to self-determination and to establishing their own independent state. This would ensure the security of all in the region that partial settlements could not achieve. We also express our deep concern at the deterioration of the situation in the Gulf area, in many Latin American countries, in the Caribbean, and especially, in the Central American countries, including the threat of military intervention in El Salvador, in Southeast Asia, and at the problems of Cyprus, East Timor, and other areas.

We express our deep concern at the situation which has emerged concerning Afghanistan. We insist on an immediate political solution to the problem, a solution that should provide for the withdrawal of all foreign military contingents from the country, guarantees of national security, self-determination and sovereignty of the Afghan peo-

ple, and normalisation of relations between Afghanistan and the neighbouring countries.

We demand a just and lasting political solution to all international conflicts on the basis of the principles mentioned above. We support the liberation struggle of the peoples of South Africa, Namibia and Western Sahara and regard the possession of nuclear capability by the apartheid regime in South Africa as a serious threat to peace in Africa and the whole world.

15. We express our solidarity with peoples, youth and students all over the world fighting against imperialism, expansionism and hegemonism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, settler-colonialism, fascism and neofascism, militarism, racism and apartheid, with all those who fight against all forms of oppression, exploitation and discrimination, for their national liberation and social justice, for democracy, human rights, freedom and independence, for sovereignty and territorial integrity, seeing in these efforts an important contribution to the struggle for lasting peace.

16. We are determined to continue and to intensify our work for peace, detente and disarmament, using different forms of action suiting the traditions, conditions and structures of national, regional and international co-operation.

We demand the right of youth to participate in all planning and decision-making concerning the common future of humanity. Education for peace, mutual understanding and co-operation, as well as youth exchange, are of great significance in creating positive attitudes to disarmament and detente. It is imperative that children and young people are made aware of the dangers of all forms of violence and injustice. Peace education is a common task for us.

17. We shall intensify our co-operation, among other structures, through the Geneva Informal Meeting, to contribute to the best arrangement for the Disarmament Week declared by the United Nations, to act in favour of good preparations for the next United Nations General Assembly Special Session on Disarmament, and to actively promote preparations for, and realisation of, the International Youth Year 1985 for Participation, Development, and Peace.

18. We call upon the young generation to put aside all that divides us and join hands in maintaining peace and attaining disarmament. This can be done in different ways on local, national, regional and international levels with the broadest possible mobilisation and involve-

ment of young people. To fulfil these aims and to follow up the general aims of this World Forum of Youth and Students for Peace, Detente and Disarmament, activities should be organised with the best utilisation of existing structures and existing experiences of joint co-operation.

19. The young generation refuses to submit to a destiny of war and disaster. We shall all together establish a world of everlasting peace and a better future for humanity.

20. We, representatives of youth and student organisations, gathered in Helsinki, January 19-23, 1981, at the World Forum of Youth and Students for Peace, Detente and Disarmament, express our appreciation to the National Committee of Finnish Youth Organisations for organising and hosting this important event. The warm hospitality and excellent working conditions provided by it have been of great importance for the successful holding of the World Forum.

DISARMAMENT AND PEACE FOR THE DECADE OF THE EIGHTIES

Resolution of the Bureau of the WPC Presidential Committee

Antananarivo, January 23-26, 1981

The peoples of the world have entered the year 1981 full of hopes for peace and social progress. Yet, at the same time, they are full of fear for their future. They are challenged by an unprecedented arms build-up, a revival of the cold war psychosis and a danger never met before—global nuclear conflagration. Their concern is still deeper in many parts of the world where they have inherited backwardness and poverty, growing unemployment and economic crisis.

The millions of people of all continents know that their vital interests and disarmament are inseparable. They demand reduction of military budgets; an end to the imperialist military build-up and the employment of all resources to promote social progress, development and struggle against hunger. The world is over-saturated with arms, while it needs peace. Ranting about war and open threats to use force should give way to sober-minded thinking and dialogue.

Our activities since the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace, held in Sofia in September 1980 with the broadest participation of different political forces, has proved the need for, and effectiveness of, mass campaigns and actions on all levels to advance the cause of disarmament and detente. All who stand for the peace and security of nations can and must act together.

Let's do all in our power to make the new decade peaceful, to curb the arms race and eventually to make nuclear war impossible.

Potentialities exist for that!

Public opinion must initiate a vast offensive in favour of disarmament, detente and international co-operation. This is the guideline of the Programme of Action for 1981 which the Bureau has approved at

this session. It emphasises that the new campaigns should concentrate on:

- continuing in a constructive manner negotiations on the limitation of strategic arms;

- preventing the deployment of the new US nuclear missiles in Europe; completing negotiations on all medium-range missiles, taking into account all aspects of the problem;

- stepping up and expanding actions of solidarity with the struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America for freedom and for political and economic independence from imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, and racism.

The Bureau calls upon the peace movements and organisations, in particular those of Europe, immediately to undertake initiatives to promote the successful outcome of the Madrid Meeting and the convening of a conference on military detente in Europe.

We call on the national peace movements and organisations to strengthen and extend their action, so as to involve everyone in the just and noble struggle for the prime right of all humanity—the right to peace.

We call upon them to widely observe the UN Disarmament Week (Oct. 26-31) and to prepare for the 2nd Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament (1982).

To this end we call for mass actions—to take place at the national, regional and international levels during the spring-summer campaign for detente and disarmament and against the dangers of war and the nuclear arms race.

FOR A CONFERENCE ON EUROPEAN DISARMAMENT

Appeal of the Special NGO Committee on Disarmament

Geneva, February 2-6, 1981

We, the undersigned non-governmental organisations, are deeply disturbed by the deterioration of the international situation, the continuing arms race and the growing nuclear threat to the future of Europe, and especially the measures of manufacturing and stationing new, sophisticated nuclear weapons which augment the risk of a nuclear confrontation. Compounded with the concept that limited nuclear war is possible, even acceptable, these are new sinister factors of the ever increasing arms race.

We, the undersigned non-governmental organisations, support the statement of the NGO Conference for the Implementation of the European Conference Final Act, and call on the representatives of governments taking part in the Madrid Meeting to concentrate on constructive elaboration of practical measures to strengthen security and co-operation in Europe, and, among other things, to come to terms on the early convocation of a conference on disarmament in Europe.

We insistently call on these governments to refrain before the conference gathers from any actions that would augment the military tension, and especially from the siting of new nuclear weapons in Europe or weapons targeted on Europe.

We consider it important, if the international situation is to be improved, that all governments should abide by the principles and provision of the UN Charter, the Final Act of the European Conference on Security and Co-operation, and the Final Document of the 1978 Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament.

COMMUNIQUE

of the International Conference Against the Arms Race and for Disarmament in Europe

Stockholm, June 6-8, 1981

One hundred and sixty representatives of 85 organisations and movements from 30 European countries, the USA and Canada, and 13 international organisations took part in an open dialogue and held a broad exchange of opinions on the dangerous complication of the international situation.

The participants devoted their main attention to the threat to peace and the security of all nations created by the new, exceedingly dangerous round of the arms race impelled by the NATO decisions on the deployment of new US medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe. The decision has increased the threat of a so-called limited nuclear war that will inevitably lead to the destruction of Europe, and, indeed, to a world-wide thermonuclear catastrophe. That is why it is so urgently necessary to open negotiations on nuclear arms reduction in Europe.

In face of this serious threat a mass movement of peoples has sprung up and is steadily expanding all over the world and especially in Europe. Increasingly broad sections of the public are joining the struggle—people of different beliefs, scientists, women's and youth organisations, political parties, trade unions, religious communities and the clergy.

In spite of the diversity of positions and forms of activity, various groups and organisations are extending dialogue, co-operation and joint action at national and international levels.

There are good opportunities for a further expansion of public efforts on the national and international scales. Use may be made for this of such events as the 36th anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki (August 6-8), World Peace Day (September 1), the UN Disarmament Week (October 24-30), and the preparations for the UN General Assembly 2nd Special Session on Disarmament (May-June 1982).

These actions will contribute to the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe and will pave the way to lasting peace and disarmament.

APPEAL TO WOMEN OF THE WORLD OF THE WORLD CONGRESS OF WOMEN

Prague, October 8-13, 1981

/

The danger of nuclear war overshadows as never before the whole of humanity. It threatens every woman, every man, your child, every child.

It is brought about by the arms race instigated by governments aspiring to military supremacy, by those who make fantastic profits from the deadly arms business.

The deployment of new missiles in Western Europe and the production of the neutron bomb will lead to a qualitatively new and more dangerous round in the arms race. Time is running out.

The arms race threatens to accelerate to the point of no return. As a first step, it is necessary to ban the neutron weapons, to stop the build-up of nuclear weapons in Europe and start serious negotiations for their reduction.

It is necessary not to allow production and proliferation of nuclear arms in the Middle East, in Africa and other continents; the nuclear bases should be dismantled; the use of these weapons and other weapons of mass destruction must be condemned as a crime against humanity. All existing stockpiles of these weapons should be destroyed as a step towards general and complete disarmament.

One million dollars is spent every minute on armaments. Millions of people—women and children—suffer, starve and die as a direct result of the diversion of resources to the arms build-up. This build-up daily robs people of food, clothing, hospitals, schools and jobs. The huge military spending deprives women of the conditions necessary for the promotion of their rights.

The arms build-up must be stopped

The danger of nuclear catastrophe is intensified by the expansionist ambitions of those who, believing that whole regions of the world should serve their selfish interests, create and aggravate hotbeds of tension and armed conflict. International peace and security are endangered by those who seek to prevent countries that have broken the yoke of colonial dependence from living in peace. Acts of aggression are perpetrated against them and against people who struggle for their inalienable right to self-determination, national independence, and social progress. Armed terror is unleashed even against people who are deprived of their homeland. **THIS MUST BE STOPPED.** All forms of injustice, racial and colonial oppression and suppression of peoples must be wiped from the face of the earth.

Nuclear war can and must be prevented

It is more imperative than ever before that conflict situations in the world be settled by finding political solutions through negotiations and not by military means.

Never before has there been such a strong movement throughout the world for peace. It is essential for the survival of our children and all humanity that this movement be still more powerful and united and become an invincible force.

Women are the majority of the population of the world. Whether our children inhabit a peaceful world or all life on our planet is exterminated by nuclear war depends also on us, women.

Time does not wait!

We alert and call upon the women of the world to use all possible means—letters, resolutions of meetings and demonstrations, petitions, marches, appeals—to demand that leaders of states and governments take practical measures:

- to stop the arms race and all forms of aggression;
- to start negotiations immediately for political settlement of explosive international problems.

Let us make International Women's Day, March 8, 1982, a day of struggle of women all over the world against the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

Let us raise our voices and make ourselves heard even by those who pretend to be deaf! Let us act together! United we can save our people and the whole humanity.

DECLARATION OF THE WORLD TRADE UNION CONFERENCE ON SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF DISARMAMENT

Paris, December 15-17, 1981

We the participants in the World Trade Union Conference on Social and Economic Aspects of Disarmament have gathered at a disquieting time, when confrontation in the world arena is gaining momentum and posing a real danger of global military conflict. We do not share identical views on all the problems involved. Our opinions do not coincide on all points. Yet we all consider it necessary to unite for the common cause: *preservation of world peace*.

Being aware of the growing role and responsibility of the trade unions in the world today, we have reached agreement on some general principles concerning the ways of achieving the goal we have set ourselves.

We call on the trade unions to fight for an end to the dangerous and senseless arms race, which consumes immense resources in all countries, and for the use of the funds thus released for peaceful creative purposes and for the well-being of all working people and all nations.

The Conference is convinced that the struggle for disarmament is the main task of our day.

Peace is a common asset of all nations and working people, for only under peaceful conditions can their vital interests, their rights and freedoms be assured in full. Today mankind is confronted by a threat unprecedented in its history—the threat of nuclear catastrophe. This is why the struggle waged by workers and all sections of the population in defence of peace must be considered a priority.

This Conference expresses deep concern over the aggravation of world tension at the present time and the slowing down of the process of detente, that essential precondition for lasting peace.

The arms race, primarily the nuclear arms race, is increasingly turning our planet into a gigantic arsenal of a terrible force of destruction. This arsenal, in fact, is now sufficient for the destruction of all life on earth many times over. This danger has grown even more because of the decision to deploy nuclear missiles in Western Europe and to produce the neutron bomb. But the accumulation of arms has not strengthened peace or security. It has increased the danger of thermo-nuclear catastrophe. It has now become evident that military power does not imply security and that it is impossible to achieve peace by means of an arms build-up.

The race in both conventional and nuclear arms is not only weakening security but increasing the danger of a new war. The arms race is not only fraught with the danger of a potential catastrophe. For even now, in peacetime, it exerts a negative influence on various spheres of public life. It constitutes a particular threat to the social and economic interests of the working people, that is, the sphere in which the trade unions act in the first place. This Conference notes that protection of the vital interests of the working people and the fight against the arms race have never been so tightly and inseparably interlinked as today.

The arms race is absorbing enormous amounts of materials and financial and human resources. These resources are used for aims that are incompatible with the real needs of nations and the working people and with socio-economic progress. Military expenditure in the world exceeds 500 billion dollars; 60 million men are servicing the military machine in one way or another. This vast and unprecedented waste is taking place in a world where one human being in three has no access to elementary medical care, where one in five is illiterate, one in six is suffering from undernourishment, where 50 million die yearly from hunger, and millions of others suffer from unemployment and inflation.

The arms race, which imposes a heavy burden on the working people, is a source of superprofits for the transnational corporations and assures them, without any risk, guaranteed markets, both at home and abroad.

From the economic point of view, the arms race and the boosting of military expenditure means that more and more funds are constantly taken away from peaceful projects as arms are incessantly perfected and become more and more expensive. It also means that a proportion

of products are systematically excluded from the process of reproduction and, employed for military purposes, thus cannot be used either as consumer goods or as means of production.

The ever-increasing re-assignment of resources to military aims restricts investment in the civilian branches of industry, causes disproportions and imbalances in the economy, constitutes a brake on economic growth, reduces the volume of civilian production, and provokes other phenomena which have negative effects on the socio-economic condition of the working people.

Unemployment is today one of the most acute social problems in most countries. Young people under the age of 25 constitute an increasing proportion of the unemployed. Their future and their prospects of employment are severely limited by the present arms race. The fact that the rising level of unemployment goes hand in hand with increased military expenditure is no coincidence. The two are intrinsically linked. Investment in military production creates only half the number of jobs the same investments would create in civilian production. With the growth of military expenditure the gap between civilian and military production in ensuring employment is growing wider, and this means that the civilian economy will be losing more and more jobs.

Consequently, this Conference notes that military expenditure does not help keep up the level of employment but, on the contrary, contributes to the growth of unemployment and denies millions of young people the opportunity of taking part in socially useful work.

Inflation has a negative effect on the position of the working people throughout most of the world. It results largely from the arms race, militarisation of economies and increase in military expenditure. These aggravate inflation and increase disparities in economic development, upset the balance between production and consumption, increase deficits in national budgets, present satisfaction of social needs by limiting the role and functions of public services and helping further growth of big capital.

The Conference points out that the arms race stimulates inflation and has disruptive and negative effects on economic and social processes. These, first and foremost, have repercussions on the economic situation of the working people, causing steep price increases and pushing up the cost of living.

The arms race devours a considerable part of the budget of all countries, regardless of their social structure.

The money comes chiefly from different taxes, the main burden of which is borne by the working people.

It is primarily the working people who have to pay for the consequences of the arms race.

Along with direct taxes, they also pay indirect taxes, whose growth is concealed in the increased prices. The latter have particularly disastrous consequences for the most underprivileged working people and their families (the low-waged, those with large families, the disabled, etc.).

The Conference notes that it is the working people who have to pay for the arms race policies.

The arms race is slowing down the overcoming of the economic backwardness by the countries that have thrown off colonial rule, preventing their development along the road of socio-economic progress and obstructing a new international economic order.

The military expenditure of the developing countries is also growing. It is now three times greater than the "aid" they receive.

The Conference notes that the arms race, which has also spread to the developing countries, is draining the resources of these countries so needed to build up their national economies, to develop industry and agriculture, and to solve the most acute social problems plaguing large sections of their population. The arms race also creates political tensions in the relations between these countries and increases their economic dependence on other states.

The arms race and the attending atmosphere of tension are upsetting normal economic relations among states, notably those with different social systems, and are putting a brake on the realisation of the new international economic order; meanwhile, development of such relations accords with the interests of all working people.

This Conference notes that the arms race deprives society of the possibility of constructively using its enormous human, material and financial resources. As a result of military preparations, society is throwing away the chance of creating material and other benefits to a value much greater than the total truly astronomical military expenditures of the modern world. In evaluating the negative aspects of the arms race, one should also take into consideration the opportunities lost in this way.

Guided by the working people's interests and expressing their will, the Conference resolutely condemns:

—any action leading to an increase in international tension and fur-

ther escalation of the arms race, any installation of weapons of mass destruction outside the borders of those states to which they belong, any production of new types of such weapons;

—any doctrine which admits the possibility of initiating even a limited nuclear war.

The Conference participants express a sincere desire to contribute by whatever means to any measures aimed at safeguarding and consolidating peace, pursuing the policy of detente and promoting co-operation and confidence-building among states, and in this context are in favour of:

—limiting strategic arms, banning the production, testing, deployment and use of nuclear weapons, and progress in the negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States;

—bringing the Madrid meeting to a constructive conclusion and convening a European conference on military detente and disarmament;

—the dissolution of military blocs;

—ensuring that the United Nations Second Special Session on Disarmament in 1982 achieves positive results and that immediate steps are taken towards disarmament of a worldwide scale, the resources thereby released to be used to solve the problem of poverty in the world.

The participants in the World Trade Union Conference on Social and Economic Aspects of Disarmament are firmly convinced that the policy of disarmament can and must replace the present arms race policy. No other policy can consolidate peace, prevent the threat of a new war and remove it for all time from society, and give further impulse to international detente and to the development of international co-operation on the principles of peaceful coexistence.

This Conference appeals to all governments to take the necessary measures to reach political decisions paving the way to disarmament. The Conference supports all efforts to proclaim separate countries or groups of countries nuclear-free zones.

Disarmament accords with the interests of social progress. It will not eliminate domination and exploitation of countries, nations and working people that may be seen today in many parts of the globe, nor the socio-economic systems which give birth to them. But it can facilitate the solution of numerous important problems, and put to productive use additional labour and material resources, and that means vast pro-

duction and energy capacities, millions of tons of mineral raw materials, steel, nonferrous and rare metals and so forth.

For civilian production it can free a gigantic potential of science and technology presently employed in the sphere of armaments, thus permitting the full utilisation of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution in the interest of mankind, in order to realise projects of a creative nature.

Disarmament accords with the interests of the working people. It will stimulate economic and social development by making use of the resources freed for the satisfaction of the vital needs of mankind: elimination of famine and poverty in vast regions of the globe, growth of material well-being and the overall standards of life and civilisation for all nations. It will create conditions for switching large sums that are now spent on the production of means of destruction, to creative, peaceful purposes: development of industry, transport, agriculture, education, medical services, science and culture, increasing aid to the developing countries in the interest of their economic and social development, protection of the environment, exploration of outer space and the World Ocean. Disarmament would be to the advantage of the whole of mankind and would assure universal progress. The Conference welcomes the resolution adopted by the International Labour Organisation concerning the economic and social consequences of disarmament and voices the hope that ILO takes vigorous action to put it into practice.

The realisation of the advantages resulting from the policy of disarmament presumes reconversion, that is, the transfer of the manpower and material resources of nations from the military to the civilian sphere. This reconversion is an instrument of disarmament. Disarmament does not have to be general and complete to make reconversion possible. This can also be realised at a corresponding level under conditions of partial disarmament and reduction of military expenditure.

There is no "technical impossibility" of reconversion, nor are there any allegedly pernicious and irreparable consequences of reconversion for the economy and society as a whole. The participants in the Conference are deeply convinced that reconversion is possible and technically feasible. The problems presented by it are not more complex than modifications of technology and economic priorities successfully tackled by science and industry today. At the same time no difficulties, no problems, no potential socio-economic losses due to reconversion can

be compared in volume with the real damage caused by the continuation of the arms race and the serious threat it poses to mankind. The Conference welcomes both the initiatives taken by groups of workers and by trade unions to draw up plans to transform military production into civilian production, and national reconversion programmes.

The situation in the field of employment can be improved as a result of reconversion. The transfer of resources from the military to the civilian sphere will make it possible to create a great number of new jobs, notably in industries that are vitally important for raising the standard of living of working people, and to finance projects which at present suffer from restrictions because of enormous military expenditure: public health, education, social security, development of public transport and communications, urban development, etc.

Reconversion will not generate mass layoffs and reduction of employment in the military branches of industry, if these are converted to the production of goods that are socially useful and necessary for the development of the economy and the improvement of the living conditions of the population. It is primarily this conversion that will establish a material base opening the way to the solution of the global problems of our times, such as energy, environmental protection, exploring the biosphere, utilisation of the resources of the World Ocean, food, the fight against diseases and illiteracy, etc. The solution of these problems requires concentrated efforts in the branches of industry that include the most developed ones, that is, those now producing armaments. The solution of these problems presumes the employment of personnel and of experts of high qualification presently engaged in arms production.

Reconversion will encounter various difficulties and obstacles depending on the social system in countries where military production exists.

In the capitalist countries the commercial character of military production, high profits and the various advantages enjoyed by military-industrial corporations, are the reason for their negative and hostile attitude to reconversion.

This necessitates a continuous and co-ordinated struggle against the malpractices of the transnational corporations which impose their economic domination and use public money to develop military production, which is a source of superprofits for them.

Overcoming the resistance of these forces is a necessary condition for reconversion in these countries.

The Conference therefore welcomes the recent massive growth of the anti-war movement in Western Europe, the United States and other countries, and in particular the overwhelming support given by young people to this movement. The Conference calls on the trade unions to assist in building ever greater support for this movement.

Reconversion in the socialist countries, due to the absence of privately owned means of production, allows for conversion of investments and resources of the military industry, which are not productive, to industries making civilian goods that are more necessary and productive. This will instantly lead to an increase of the national wealth of these countries.

In the developing countries, where national military production is almost nonexistent, reconversion will not create difficulties. By putting an end to the excessive buying of arms it would be possible to use the released funds to finance the development of these countries.

The Conference participants particularly underline that the involvement of the working people and trade unions in the process of reconversion and in the democratic monitoring of this process should guarantee that advanced scientific and technological know-how used in military fields should serve:

- the needs of civilian production not only with the aim of expanding this production, but also of increasing the free time and thus the cultural opportunities for workers;

- progress in developing countries rather than any increase in the profits of transnational corporations.

The participants in the World Trade Union Conference on Social and Economic Aspects of Disarmament condemn the development of all forms of arms in all countries as being contrary to the preservation of peace in the world and damaging to the needs of working people.

The representatives of trade unions of the most different trends declare their full support for the fight against the senseless inflation of military spending, and are in favour of using national budgets for peaceful aims, social progress, development, elimination of famine, etc., and of satisfying the basic demands of workers in city and country.

The World Trade Union Conference on Social and Economic Aspects of Disarmament appeals to the governments of the nuclear powers to contribute to the progress of negotiations on disarmament at bilateral, regional and multilateral levels, so that concrete measures may be taken

towards disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, which would be in the interest of the working people throughout the world.

The tasks are not easy, but feasible. Today the balance of world forces favours those who fight for peace, progress and national independence.

Among them the working people and their representative organisations have a specific role to play in the attainment of the objectives which agitate the minds of the majority of mankind and in the elimination of the causes of the arms race and military conflicts.

The united actions of the workers are dictated by the objective necessity, contributing to the development of progressive movements. That is why our Conference calls on the working people throughout the world to leave aside all that may divide them and join the struggle, which may have different forms, for the discontinuation of the arms race, for peace and social progress.

The World Trade Union Conference on Social and Economic Aspects of Disarmament appeals to all the governments taking part in the UN Second Special Session on Disarmament to do all they can to achieve positive results in working towards complete and general disarmament.

The World Trade Union Conference on Social and Economic Aspects of Disarmament believes that the UN Second Special Session on Disarmament must be the prelude to the calling and holding of a world conference on disarmament as a forum for the examination of urgent measures of disarmament and the achievement of lasting world peace.

The participants in this Conference appeal to you to fight for the attainment of these objectives which accord with the interests of the working people, for the attainment of these common and realistic perspectives.

INDEX

A

Abrosimov, Pyotr—244

Academies—

—USSR Academy of Sciences—15, 24, 186, 188, 191, 204, 222, 223, 227, 246, 257-59, 330-32, 335, 336, 340-42, 346, 348

—Institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences—15, 24, 77, 130, 188, 191, 222, 257, 330-32, 335, 336, 340-42, 346, 348, 349

—US National Academy of Sciences—52

—Pontiacal Academy of Sciences—326

Adamishin, Anatoly—263

African National Congress—232, 395

Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organisation—219-21, 273, 284, 288

Agreements—

—Agreement on Measures to Reduce the Risk of Accidental Nuclear War (Washington, 30 September 1971)—269

—Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War (Washington, 22 June 1973)—62, 73, 78, 82

—Quadripartite Agreement on West Berlin between the USSR, USA,

Britain, and France (West Berlin, 3 September 1971)—244, 325

Aksyonov, Vladimir—177

Alexandrov, Anatoly—15

Alexyi, Metropolitan of Tallin and Estonia—321

Alexyi, Patriarch—150

All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions (AUCCTU)—192, 193, 195, 197, 204, 340

Almeida, Joaquim Tenreirode—392

American Committee on East-West Accord—323

American Friends Service Committee (of Quakers)—216, 217, 290

Andrade, Jose Julio—392

Andrei, Stefan—376, 415

Andropov, Yuri—368

Anti-war movement—122, 123, 127-29, 132, 250, 254, 425, 427, 471

Anti-missile movement—122

ANZUS Treaty—248

Appeal of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR "To the Parliaments and Peoples of the World"—127, 157, 210, 307, 351

Arab League—304, 306

Arbatov, Georgi—187, 227

Arkhipov, Ivan—368, 391

Asia Christian Peace Conference—156

Assad, Hafiz Al—283, 367

Assemblies of Public Forces for Security and Co-operation in Europe (Brussels, 1972, 1975)—195, 205
 Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASSAN)—268, 293
 Associations—
 —American Lawyers' Association—171, 172
 —Association of Republican Air Pilots—202
 —Association for Ties Between Soviet and Foreign Cities—234
 —Association of Soviet Lawyers—169, 171, 172, 237
 —UN Association of Great Britain—175
 —UN Association of Hungary—175
 —Indian UN Federation—175
 —Soviet UN Association—173-76, 189
 —American UN Association—175
 —UN Association of FRG—175
 —World Association of World Federalists—216
 Avakov, Mirza—260

B

Babakhan, mufti Zyaudinkhan ibn Ishan—158
 Bahr, Egon—311
 Ball, George W.—323, 324
 Balzac, Honoré de—140
 Barialay, Mahmud—369
 Barnaby, Frank—190
 Bastian, Gert—58, 121, 426
 Baudissin, Wolf Graf von—226
 Bayih, Berhanu—383
 Belashchenko, Tom—245, 266
 Belete, Shewandagn—388
 Beletski, Victor—250
 Belinsky, Vissarion—59
 Bell, George—172
 Bendjedid, Chadli—305
 Bergedorf Discussion Club—216

Birnbaum, Karl—190
 Bismarck, Otto—98
 Bjornerstedt, Rolf—190
 Blackby, Frank—190
 Bohr, Niels—253
 Bondarev, Yuri—139
 Borisov, Oleg—245, 250
 Bovin, Alexander—95, 245
 Branco, Antonio Rodrigues—392
 Brandt, Willy—42, 297, 308
 Brest peace (1918)—144
 Brezhnev, Leonid—25, 28, 34, 38, 42, 44, 47, 49, 52, 56, 67, 76, 84, 97, 100, 119, 124, 126-228, 145, 170, 171, 205, 207, 208, 214, 221, 228, 238, 241, 242, 266, 275-80, 285, 288, 289, 296-300, 302, 303, 306-08, 311, 313, 314, 316, 318-23, 325, 326, 328, 343, 361, 367, 374, 375, 382, 383, 390, 391, 399, 404, 408, 409, 414, 427
 Brikin, Vladimir—252
 British Quakers' Society—349
 Brown, Freda—182
 Brown, Harold—102, 104, 106, 280
 Brul, Reinhard—247
 Bruskov, Vladimir—189
 Bykov, Oleg—77, 187, 227, 257

C

Camus, Albert—146
 Carrington, Peter A. R.—309
 Carter, James—65, 66, 72, 100-02, 104, 105, 118, 255, 262, 274, 280, 287
 Castaneda, Jorge H.—303
 Central Treaty Organisation (CENTO)—248
 Chandra, Romesh—125
 Chazov, Yevgeni—51, 53
 Cherkassky, Leonid—249
 Chernenko, Konstantin—98, 243
 Chernyakov, Yuri—392
 Chissano, Joaquim Alberto—391
 Chivian, Eric—53

- Chnoupek, Buhoslav—376, 415
- Christian Peace Conference (CPC)
—150-52, 155, 156, 331
- Churchill, Winston—253
- Clausewitz, Karl—96, 98, 108
- Cohen, Samuel—140
- Colloquiums, international on peace
and disarmament—127, 169, 170,
208, 236, 338
- Colombo, Emilio—285
- Commission of the Churches on In-
ternational Affairs—152
- Commission on European Security
and Co-operation—155
- Committee of Youth Organisations
of the USSR—177-79, 204
- Communist Party of the Soviet Uni-
on (CPSU)—12, 22, 28, 29, 41,
42, 94, 99, 205, 254, 296-99,
301, 302, 308, 313, 328
- Peace Programme—29, 41, 42,
200, 205, 254, 296
- Programme of Further Struggle
for Peace and International Co-
operation, and for the Freedom
and Independence of the Peoples
—41, 254
- 26th Congress of the CPSU—10,
22, 24-29, 31, 34, 38, 42, 44, 47,
52, 66, 67, 75, 76, 94, 119, 122,
128, 145, 167, 187, 192, 200,
205, 207, 208, 212, 228, 233, 238
296-99, 301, 303, 343, 369
- Peace Programme for the 1980s—
45, 67, 167, 210, 212, 352, 427
- Conferences—
- Bandung Conference—221, 273
- Berlin Conference of the Commu-
nist and Workers' Parties of Euro-
pe (1976)—48, 134
- World Conference "Dialogue on
Problems of Disarmament and
Detente" (Vienna, 1982)—214,
215, 291, 318
- International Conference for a
Peaceful and Secure Future for
All Children (Moscow, 1979)—
178, 232
- World Conference of the UN De-
cade for Women (Copenhagen,
July 1980)—184, 277
- World Disarmament Conference
(convocation)—273, 421, 444,
472
- Conference on Nuclear War in Eu-
rope (Netherlands, April 1981)—
124
- Second session of the UN Confer-
ence on the prohibition or restric-
tion of the use of certain types
of conventional weapons that may
be regarded as exclusively cruel
and/or non-selective (Geneva,
September-October 1980)—281
- European conference on military
detente and disarmament (convo-
cation)—174, 201, 208, 288, 299,
317, 376, 378, 379, 397, 430,
435, 438, 442, 449, 453, 458, 468
- Second International Conference
to review the operation of the
Treaty on the Non-Proliferation
of Nuclear Weapons (Geneva,
August-September 1980)—278
- A conference of representatives of
national peace movements in
NATO countries (Brussels, 1980)
—275
- Conference of socialist and social-
democratic parties of West Euro-
pean countries (Paris, March
1981)—298
- Conferences on peace and disarma-
ment—
- of women organisations—183, 184,
323
- of physicians—56, 338, 339
- of youth—178, 180
- of non-governmental organisations
—174, 175, 195, 214, 215, 275,
310, 458
- of trade unions—127, 195, 196,
198, 326, 327, 464
- of religious activists—150-53, 159-
62, 163, 280, 321
- of lawyers—170, 342

- International conference for the prohibition of nuclear weapons (Tokyo, Nagasaki, Hiroshima, August 1981)—127, 214, 310
- First international conference of liberators of the prisoners of Nazi concentration camps (Washington, October 1981)—202
- International Conference of Parliamentarians for Peace, Disarmament and International Security (Helsinki, May 1980)—213, 274, 437
- International Conference "Human Rights and Peace—Peace and Human Rights" (Warsaw, July 1980)—333
- International conferences (regional) on peace and disarmament—127, 213, 214, 275, 304, 305, 458
- Fourth Inter-Parliamentary Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (Brussels, May 1980)—271, 438
- Scientific Conference "International Politics in the Eighties" (Hamburg, October 1981)—346
- Fourth Soviet-West German Conference on Relations between the USSR and the FRG (Yerevan, May 1980)—331
- Consultative conferences of the peace organisations of the socialist countries (Moscow, December 1980; Budapest, October 1981)—216
- Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE)—78, 100, 174, 195, 203, 205, 263, 278, 325, 378
- Final Act—152, 155, 174, 201, 205, 209, 235, 263, 278, 287, 288, 377-80, 421, 422, 429, 430, 435, 449, 453, 458
- Congresses—
 - World Congresses of Defenders of Peace—150, 286
 - World Women's Congress "For Equality, National Independence and Peace" (Prague, October 1981)—182, 184, 318, 460
 - World Forum of Peace Forces (Moscow, October 1973)—195, 214
 - 10th World Congress of Twin Cities (Casablanca, November 1981)—237
 - World trade union congresses—194, 195
 - All-Christian Peace Congresses (Prague, June 1961, 1978)—151
 - Hague Peace Congress (1922)—193
 - Congress of Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (Hamburg)—58, 344
 - International Congress of Defenders of Peace (Brussels, September 1936)—193
- Conventions—
 - Convention on non-aggression and non-use of force in relations between Asia and Pacific states (draft)—308
 - Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxic Weapons and on their Destruction (entered into force in March 1975)—118
 - Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Technique (Geneva, May 1977)—267, 268
 - Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Dangerous or to have Indiscriminate Effects (New York, April 1981)—300
 - International convention on banning the production, stockpiling,

deployment, and use of neutron munitions (draft)—91, 306
 —International convention to reinforce security guarantees to non-nuclear states (draft)—116, 117
 Co-operation group "Stop the Neutron Bomb, Stop the Nuclear Arms Race" (Netherlands)—216
 Council of Europe—333
 Council of European National Youth Committees—179
 Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA)—252, 258
 Culver, John C.—323
 Czyrek, Yusef—376, 415

D

Dai, Tobias—392
 Danish Committee of Co-operation for Peace and Security—124
 Davydov, Valery—249
 Debele, Geremew—383
 Declarations—
 —Declaration on the Consequences of the Use of Nuclear Weapons—326
 —UN Declaration on the Granting of Independence to the Colonial Countries and Peoples—407, 412
 —Joint Soviet-Indian Declaration (New Delhi, December 10, 1980)—288, 361, 403-09
 Decree on Peace (8 November, 1917)—41, 144
 Diligensky, Cherman—130
 Dinka, Tesfaye—383
 Dorofeev, Boris—250
 Dost, Shah Mohammad—369
 Dostoyevsky, Fyodor—140
 Dzasokhov, Alexander—219

E

Edward III—110
 Efremov, Alexander—207, 251
 Eichmann, Karl Adolf—141

Einstein, Albert—16, 253
 Eisenhower, Dwight D.—224
 Ellsberg, Daniel—104
 Emelianov, Vasili—225, 227, 250
 Engelhardt, Vladimir—225
 Engels, Frederick—39, 40, 96, 146
 Ershova, Elena—251
 Estaing, Valery Giscard d'—275, 294
 European Council of Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church—321
 European Economic Community (EEC)—252, 333
 European Society of Culture (ESC)—235

F

Falin, Valentin—59, 226
 Fälldin, Thordjörn—319
 Fedorenko, Nikolai—226, 227
 Fedorov Evgeny—187, 188, 267, 290
 Feld, Bernard T.—225
 Fermi, Enrico—253
 Ferreira, Joao dos Santos—392
 Filaret, Metropolitan of Kiev and Galich—155
 Finnish Peace Committee—183
 Firubin, Nikolai—392
 Fischer, Oskar—415
 Fischer, Roger—107
 Fokin, Alexander—227
 Foot, Michael—123, 316
 Ford, Gerald—64, 65, 262
 Forums—
 —World Forum of Peace Forces (Moscow, January 1977)—195
 —World Forum of International Non-Governmental Organisations (Brussels, June 1980)—332
 —World Forum of Youth and Students for Peace, Detente and Disarmament (Helsinki, January 1981)—179, 291, 428, 455
 —European Forum for Disarmament and Security (Belgium, De Kaan, 1979)—156, 170, 208

- International Forum “Dialogue on Problems of Disarmament and Detente” (Vienna, May 1980)—213, 273, 433
- International Forum on Science and Disarmament—189
- Regional Forum “For a Nuclear-Free Zone in the Pacific, for Independence and Peace” (Sydney, September 1980)—282
- Public Forum in Krefeld (FRG, November 1980)—285
- Frank, Ilya—225
- Frolov, Ivan—252
- Frydenlund, Kunt—290
- Fulbright, James W.—323

G

- Gaddafi, Muammar Al—301
- Galbraith, J. Kenneth—324
- Galilei, Galileo—62
- Gandhi, Indira—311, 404, 495
- Gantman, Vladimir—263, 264
- Gayler, Noel A. M.—324
- Gebre, Kassa—383
- Gedle-Giorgis, Feleke—383
- Gemechu, Mengistu—383
- Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare (1925)—118
- Genscher, Hans-Dietrich—276, 298
- Goldberger, Marvin—343
- Gomes, Francisco da Costa—121, 426
- Gorbatov, Oleg—249
- Gorky, Maxim—145
- Gray, Colin S.—107
- Granchikov, Georgy—266
- Gromyko, Andrei—242, 250, 254, 270, 272, 276, 278, 282, 301, 306, 309, 312, 317, 368, 376, 382, 391, 415
- Gvishiani, Jermen—187

H

- Habrè Hissène—290
- Haig, Alexander—67-70, 125, 293, 315, 317
- Harbottle, Michael—426
- Heisenberg, Werner—253
- Himmeler, Heinrich—141
- Hippocrat—52
- Hodgkin, Dorothy—228

I

- Ibragimov, Mirza—221
- Ignatov, Victor—261
- Ilyichov, Leonid—383
- Ilyin, Leonid—53
- Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues—127, 289, 295, 301, 306, 316, 320, 324, 426
- Inozemtsev, Nikolai—24, 186-88, 248, 258, 343
- Institutes—
 - Austrian Institute for International Affairs—190
 - Institutes of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR (See the AS of the USSR)—
 - Vienna International Institute for Peace—189, 213, 331, 334, 338, 345, 347
 - Institute of Peace Studies of Vienna University—334
 - Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI)—190
 - Royal Institute of International Affairs (Great Britain)—348
 - Indian Institute of Defence Research and Analysis—349
 - French Institute for International Relations—338
 - Finnish International Relations Institute—331
 - Institute of Politics and Economics (Hans Riessen)—206, 346

International Association of Democratic Lawyers—169-72, 235, 336
 International Atomic Energy Agency—113, 251
 International committee of scientists for the prevention of nuclear war (convocation)—228, 348
 International Committee of Red Cross (ICRC)—336
 International Committee for European Security and Co-operation—127, 169, 205, 206, 208, 429, 448
 International Federation of Resistance Movements—200, 202
 International Federation of Liberal and Radical Youth—179
 International Labour Organisation (ILO)—197, 198
 International Liaison Forum of Peace Forces—214, 436
 International Peace Bureau—216
 International Union of Students (IUS)—178-80
 Inter-Parliamentary Union—448
 Islip, Simon, Archbishop of Canterbury—110
 Israelyan, Victor—112, 250, 253, 260
 Ivanov, Sergei—252

J

Javits, Jacob K.—323
 Jigalov, Ivan—253
 Jilin, Pavel—247
 Joliot-Curie, Frederic—253
 Jrgensen, Anker—311

K

Kapitsa, Sergei—226
 Kaplan, Martin—228
 Karmal, Babrak—283, 369, 375
 Kekkonen, Urho—124, 285
 Kennan, George—324
 Kennedy, John F.—64

Kharkhardin, Oleg—211
 Kharlamov, Yuri—428
 Kidan, Tesfaye Gebre—383
 Kingston McCloughry—96, 97
 Kirilenko, Andrei—242
 Kirnasovsky, Boris—383
 Kissinger, Henry—97, 101, 102
 Kokoshin, Andrei—255
 Koloskov, Boris—245
 Kornienko, Georgy—259
 Kosygin, Alexei—375
 Kosyrev, Andrei—254
 Kotlyarov, Ivan—255
 Koumanakos, Georgios—121, 426
 Kovalevsky, Maxim—111
 Kramerhaus, the West Berlin church organisation—331
 Kreisky, Bruno—226, 272
 Kruglova, Zinaida—234
 Krupskaya, Nadezhda—110
 Kujela, Zacarias—392
 Kulikov, Victor—246
 Kunaev, Dinmuhammed—242
 Kurchatov, Igor—14, 253
 Kuzin, Mikhail—53
 Kvitsinsky, Yuli—324

L

Laroque, Gene Robert—121
 Lavrentyev, Alexander—256
 League of Nations—224
 Lebedev, Mikhail—361
 Lebedev, Nikolai—256
 Le Duan—314
 Lee, John Marshall—58, 426
 Lenin, Vladimir—18, 28, 35, 39-41, 96, 110, 143, 145, 424
 Levin, David—257
 Lown, Bernard—53, 57
 Luxemburg, Rosa—39, 40

M

MacBride, Sean—170
 Machel, Samora Moises—286, 391, 392, 398, 399

Machungo, Mario da Graça—391
 MacMahon Act of 1946—249
 Maltsev, Victor—260
 Mann, Thomas—44
 Mao Zedong—32, 259, 268
 Maresyev, Alexei—199
 Mariam, Mengistu Haile—284, 382, 383, 390
 Markov, Moisei—187, 188, 223, 226
 Maroudos, Dimitrios—321
 Martenson, Jan—433
 Marx, Karl—39, 40, 45, 96, 146
 McNamara, Robert—102
 —Meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe for Peace and Disarmament (Paris, April 1980)—134, 270
 —World Conference of War Veterans for Disarmament (Rome, October 1979)—201
 —Meeting of the public personalities from 21 European countries for Dialogue—Madrid-80 (Brussels, November 1980)—286, 448
 —Dartmouth meetings—189, 217, 349
 —International Meeting in Solidarity with the People of Afghanistan (Kabul, 1980)—221
 —Madrid meeting of the 35 state-participants of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe—154, 174, 201, 202, 207, 270, 281, 283, 285, 286, 288, 292, 294, 299, 302, 310, 320, 328, 331, 372, 376, 378-80, 397, 415, 421, 422, 430, 435, 438, 442, 458, 467
 —Meetings of religious activists—154-56, 304, 321, 334, 347
 —Meetings of scientists—334, 343, 348, 350
 —Meetings of women—182-84
 Mendeleyev, Dmitri—141
 Meyenfeldt, Michael Hermann—426
 Mies, Herbert—123
 Milstein, Mikhail—226
 Mirsky, Zinovy—253

Mladenov, Pyotr—376, 415
 Mohammed ibn Ismail al-Bukhari, theologian, Imam—160
 Morokhov, Igor—252
 Morozov, Grigori—186, 187
 Moskvina, Lev—259
 Mosko, Georgi—259
 Mpfumo, Joao Americo—392
 Muller, James—53
 Muskie, Edmund—282
 Muslim Board for Central Asia and Kazakhstan—158-60, 162

N

Narochinsky, Alexei—246, 265
 National Council for Peace (Japan)—126, 305
 Nechayev, Boris—361
 Negotiations—
 —Talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe (Vienna, since autumn 1973)—29, 78, 92, 113, 262, 272, 282, 290, 293, 303, 317, 380, 419, 430
 —Negotiations on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests by the USSR, USA and Britain—113-15, 276, 419
 —Soviet-American negotiations—
 —on the reduction of military activity in the Indian Ocean—78, 113, 114, 419, 420
 —on the prohibition of chemical weapons—113, 114, 273, 419
 —on the restriction of arms trade—78, 113, 114, 419
 —on the limitation of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe—30, 31, 47, 90, 91, 125, 196, 283, 316, 317, 322, 323, 328, 417, 426
 —on the anti-satellite systems—113, 114

—on the prohibition of new types
of mass destruction weapons—
113, 114

Nikolai, Metropolitan of Krutitsa
and Kolomna—150

Nikolayeva-Tereshkova, Valentina—
181

Nikonov, Alexei—263

Nitze, Paul—324

Nixon, Richard—64, 71, 100, 262

Noel-Baker, Lord—224

North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
(NATO)—10, 30, 32, 43, 68,
77-81, 87-94, 105, 107, 108, 116,
120-25, 128, 174, 176, 183, 189,
196, 198, 205, 209, 215, 245,
248, 251, 267, 286, 287, 291,
298, 299, 302, 306, 309, 311,
314-16, 322, 325, 345, 373, 416,
422, 425, 438, 441, 459

Nothomb, Charles-Ferdinand—307

Novikov, Rem—188

O

Obminsky, Ernest—260

Ogarkov, Nikolai—368, 382, 391

Olesen, Gjeld—291

Oppenheimer, Robert—253

Organisation of African Unity
(OAU)—232, 290, 313, 386,
388, 396

Organisation of American States
(OAS)—333

Oueddei, Goukouni—290

Owen, David—307

P

Palme, Olof—289, 306, 320, 426

Papandreu, Andreas—325

Pasti, Nino—121, 226, 426

Patolichev, Nikolai—252

Patricio, Hipolito Zozimo—392

Payne, Keith—107

Peace marches—125, 138, 311, 318
Pentagon—61, 80, 82, 83, 122, 125,
245

Petrovsky, Vladimir—261, 262

Physicians for Nuclear Disarma-
ment—53, 57, 121

Physicians for Social Responsibility
(the US group)—280

Pimen, Patriarch of Moscow and All
Russian—155-57, 304

Plate, Nikolai—227

Podlesny, Pavel—262

Polevoi, Boris—229

Ponomarev, Boris—243, 254, 266,
368, 382

Ponomarev, Georgi—329

Pope John Paul II—323, 326

Potsdam agreements—63

Primakov, Evgeni—187, 225

Pugwash Movement—56, 189, 223-
28, 330, 333, 335, 337, 339,
341, 344, 350

Puja, Fridyes—376, 415

Pyadyshev, Boris—264

R

Rafi, Mohammad—369

Rao, P.V. Narasimha—274, 309

Ratebzad, Anahita—369

Rashidov, Sharif—243

Reagan, Ronald—56, 57, 66-68, 73,
74, 101, 117, 123, 170, 287, 293,
298, 311, 315, 317, 320-23, 326,
327, 343, 425, 426

Reddy, Shri Neelam Sanjiva—408,
409

Resor, Stanley R.—324

Reutov, Oleg—226, 227

Romanov, Grigory—242

Roosevelt, Franklin D.—63, 253

Roshchin, Alexei—264

Rotblat, Joseph—225

Russel, Bertrand—98

Russian Orthodox Church—147-53,
155-57, 163, 233

Rybakov, Yuri—265

S

Samoteikin, Yevgeni—392
 Sanakoev, Shalva—248
 Sanguinetti, Antoine—121, 426
 Sassou-Nguesso, Denis—302, 414
 Schlesinger, James—102
 Schmidt, Helmut—276, 287, 294, 325
 Scientific Research Council on Peace and Disarmament—9, 24, 77, 186, 191, 208, 209, 258, 335, 336, 339, 341-43
 Seminars (international) on peace and disarmament—183, 184, 188, 195-98, 236, 237, 331, 335, 341, 344
 Shakhnazarov, Georgi—268
 Shakirov, Sheik Yusuf khan—162
 Shaposhnikov, Vitaly—120, 189
 Sheetikov, Alexei—203
 Sheikh Sabah al-Ahmad al-Jaber al-Sabah—300
 Shvernik, Nikolai—193
 Shvetsov, Vladislav—350
 Sidelil, Fassika—383
 Smirnov, Lev—169
 Smirnova, Nina—253
 Socialist International—135, 274, 285, 308, 317, 426, 448
 Sokolov, Igor—226, 227
 Sorsa, Kalevi—426
 South East Asia Treaty Organisation (SEATO)—248
 Soviet Afro-Asia Solidarity Committee—219-22, 231, 232
 Soviet-American Standing Consultative Commission—269
 Soviet Committee for European Security and Co-operation—188, 189, 195, 203-10, 339
 Soviet Committee of War Veterans (SCWV)—199-202, 231
 Soviet Peace Committee—156, 186, 188, 211-18, 229, 231, 232, 258, 290, 349
 Soviet Peace Fund—149, 168, 185, 187, 212, 215, 217, 229-33

Soviet Women's Committee (SWC)—181-85, 204, 231
 Special Committee of Non-Governmental Organisations on Disarmament in Geneva—215, 294, 458
 Stockholm Appeal for Peace (1950)—150
 Stoltenberg, Thorwarld—291
 Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT)—17, 63, 65, 66, 69, 73, 78, 80, 82, 85, 100, 114, 119, 176, 183, 227, 228, 255, 269, 277, 285, 306, 317, 397, 425, 429, 434, 437, 441, 452
 Subbotin, Alexander—192
 Sukharev, Alexander—169
 Suslov, Mikhail—243
 Swedish Peace Council—216
 Symposiums (international) on peace and disarmament—170, 188, 189, 237, 330, 331, 335-42, 344, 345

T

Tabejev, Fikryat—368
 Talal, Hussein ibn—304
 Tedla, Addis—383
 Teller, Edward—253
 Teplov, Leonid—247
 Tikhonov, Nikolai—243, 299, 368, 382, 399
 Titarenko, Alexander—261
 Tolstoy, Lev—141
 Tovstonogov, Georgi—142
 Treaties—
 —Draft treaty on the prohibition of neutron weapons—117
 —Draft treaty on the prohibition of radiological weapons—114
 —Draft treaty on the prohibition of deployment of any kind of weapons in outer space—312, 420
 —Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water (Moscow, 5 August 1963)—152, 267

- Soviet-American Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems (Moscow, 26 May 1972)—73, 78, 82, 269, 306
- Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (Moscow, Washington, London, 1 July, 1968)—249-51, 278, 452
- World Treaty on the Non-Use of Force and Threat of Force in International Relations—265, 287, 430, 434
- Truman, Harry S.—63
- Trukhanovsky, Vladimir—173, 226
- Tunkin, Grigory—108

U

- Ullsten, Ola—319
- Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries—169, 188, 234, 237, 335-37, 341, 342, 349
- United Nations Organisation (UNO)—116, 128, 173-76, 184, 189, 198, 201, 202, 215, 246, 253, 260-62, 265, 266, 274, 290, 300, 312, 313, 320, 332, 334, 372, 374, 387, 389, 390, 395-97, 407, 430, 436, 444, 450, 451, 453
- UN Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean—295, 313
- UN Centre for Disarmament—338, 344, 433
- UN Charter—261, 302, 306, 359, 362, 371, 372, 395, 400, 403, 410, 438, 451, 458
- UN Disarmament Commission—271, 273
- UN Disarmament Committee—112-19, 190, 262, 270, 273, 274, 276, 294, 306, 419
- UN General Assemblies—47, 101, 113, 115, 119, 261, 281, 287, 289, 294, 295, 308, 312, 314, 316, 317, 324, 385, 386, 397, 400, 420, 421

- UN General Assembly declarations on education in the spirit of peace—284
- Second Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament—175, 201, 214, 287, 290, 294, 301, 319, 323, 324, 420, 454, 460, 468, 472
- UN Security Council—30, 261, 270, 274, 276, 279, 287, 307, 308, 310, 314, 325, 327
- 1st Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament in 1978—113, 116, 175, 195, 224, 429, 433, 434, 444, 451, 458
- United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO)—173, 189, 198, 208, 284, 332, 337, 345, 436
- US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—118
- US Peace Committee—217
- Usachev, Igor—267
- Ushakov, Nikolai—257
- Ustinov, Dmitry—104, 243
- Ustinov, Vyacheslav—383, 392

V

- Vance, Cyrus—307
- Van Miert, Karel—291
- Vdovin, Valentin—392
- Vieira, Sergio—392
- Vladimirov, Semen—247
- Velihov, Evgeny—253
- Vlasyevich, Yury—247
- Volkogonov, Dmitry—248
- Voltaire—101

W

- Waldheim, Kurt—176, 270, 278, 382, 301, 302, 326
- Warsaw Treaty Organisation (WTO)—32, 43, 68, 77, 78, 80, 91, 92,

107, 246, 252, 260, 261, 263,
287, 358, 376, 379-81, 400, 402,
415, 422, 441
—Political Consultative Committee
of the WTO—260, 271, 279, 372,
376, 381, 400, 415
—Committee of Foreign Ministers of
the WTO—206, 283, 324, 358,
376, 381, 415, 423
Weinberger, Caspar—68-71, 319
Weizsacker, Karl—253
Wolde, Goshu—383
Wolde-Hanna, Gebreyes—383
Wolde-Semayat, Teferra—383
Women's International League for
Peace and Freedom—216, 323
Women's International Democratic
Federation (WIDF)—181, 182,
184
World Council of Churches (WCC)
—151, 152
World Federation of UN Associati-
ons (WFUNA)—173-76, 319
World Federation of Scientific Work-
ers—189, 197, 198, 331, 338, 339,
350
World Federation of Twin Cities
(WFTC)—235
World Parliament of the Peoples

for Peace (Sofia, September
1980)—126, 155, 156, 162, 168,
184, 189, 196, 212, 216, 266,
281, 427, 439, 447, 456
World Peace Council (WPC)—
123, 125, 155, 189, 213-15,
271, 274, 278, 286, 292, 299, 300,
320, 439, 456

Y

Yalta agreements—63
Yaropolov, Yevgeny—130
Yorysh, Abram—252
Yost, Charles—106
Young Communist League (YCL)
—177-79, 204
Yuvenaly, Metropolitan of Krutitsa
and Kolomna—147

Z

Zagladin, Vadim—34, 226, 252
Zamyatin, Leonid—392
Zeary, Saleh Mohammed—369
Zheltov, Alexei—200
Zimyanin, Mikhail—391
Zuckerman, Lord—226

REQUEST TO READERS'

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 17, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

ИБ № 12274

Редактор русского текста *Н. В. Пархоменко*
Контрольные редакторы *Н. П. Карманова,*
М. М. Лопухина
Художественный редактор *Г. Н. Губанов*
Технические редакторы *Е. В. Джигоева,*
Н. А. Кронова

Сдано в набор 9.08.82. Подписано в печать 28.10.82.
Формат 60×84^{1/16}. Бумага типографская.
Гарнитура баскервиль. Печать высокая.
Условн. печ. л. 28,36. Усл. кр.-отт. 28,81.
Уч.-изд. л. 26,46. Тираж 12.160 экз. Заказ № 1412.
Цена 2 р. 30 к. Изд. № 36622.

Ордена Трудового Красного Знамени
издательство «Прогресс»
Государственного комитета СССР
по делам издательств, полиграфии
и книжной торговли.
Москва, 119021, Зубовский бульвар, 17.

Ордена Трудового Красного Знамени
Московская типография № 7 «Искра революции»
«Союзполиграфпрома» Государственного
комитета СССР по делам издательств,
полиграфии и книжной торговли.
Москва, 121019, пер. Аксакова, 13.

PEACE AND DISARMAMENT. ACADEMIC STUDIES is a collection of articles by prominent Soviet scholars and high-level party and government executives analysing questions related to the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet government after the 26th CPSU Congress and the drive to 'curb the arms race, avert the war danger and strengthen and expand international co-operation. The collection also carries articles by clergymen, artists, and cultural workers, reviews of work for peace and disarmament by Soviet non-governmental organisations, and a reference section.



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS